# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 735 CE 023 030

TITLE Assessment of State Plans for Career Education. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, Los Alamitos, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Office of Evaluation and Dissemination.
PUB DATE 31 Jul 79
CONTRACT 300-78-0249
NOTE 149p.; Some appendix pages will not reproduce well due to small print: For a related document see CE 023 031

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education: *Compliance (Legal); Educational Legislation: Evaluation Criteria: *Federal Legislation: Federal Regulation: Federal State Relationship: *Guidelines: *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Career Education Incentive Act: *Education Amendments 1974

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to provide for each state submitting a state plan for career education to the Office of Career Education (OCE) a written assessment of the degree to which the plan complied with the requirements of Public Law 93-380. These assessments were intended to furnish direction to the states for revision and refinement of their plans. The first task was to develop criteria for evaluating the state plans. Another project task was to conduct site visits to six state education agencies to learn about problems encountered and solutions attempted during development of state plans. Thirty-eight project reports submitted with state plans for career education to OCE were then analyzed to identify problems and solutions reported by the states in the development of their plans. State Career Education Coordinators were contacted to determine states' readiness for implementation of state plans. Finally, guidelines for state plan compliance with Public Law 95-207 were developed along with a model for refining state plans. (A companion document contains the model for refining state plans.) (BM)

***********************************************************************
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
***********************************************************************

ED178735 x

*FINAL REPORT*

# ASSESSMENT OF STATE PLANS FOR CAREER EDUCATION

**Southwest Regional Laboratory for**
**Educational Research and Development**

**July 31, 1979**

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE 023 030

*This report was prepared pursuant to contract No. 300-78-0249 from the Office of Evaluation and Dissemination, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the sponsor, and no official endorsement by the sponsor should be informed.*

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

So many individuals made significant contributions to the project that it is not possible to acknowledge them adequately here. Most obvious, of course, were the contributions of the SWRL project staff: Robert Elam, who served as deputy director of the project, Barbara Lasser, Victor Berzins, C. D. Johnson, and Christopher Gomberg.

Alice Y. Scates, of the Office of Evaluation and Dissemination, served as the USOE Project Officer. She deserves credit for drawing up the original work statement and for working closely with the project team throughout the contract period. She was responsible for many of the insights and refinements which added so much to the final results. Kenneth Hoyt and Sid High gave helpful support from the Office of Career Education.

Our National Advisory Panel included Norman Gysbers, Barbara Preli, David Tiedeman, and Anne Upton. Their perspectives and expertise contributed greatly to the conceptualization and refinement of assessment criteria and to the design of the model state plan.

Walter Faulkner of the Council of Chief State School Officers was particularly helpful in providing the Project Director opportunity to meet with state coordinators of career education.

Anita M. Mitchell
Project Director

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . i

CHAPTER I--PROCEDURES . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1
Development of Criteria for Assessing State Plans for Career Education . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1
Site Visitations . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 6
Analysis of Final Project Reports . . . . . . . . . . . . . 7
Conversations with State Career Education Coordinators . . . 7
Development of Guidelines for P.L. 95-207. . . . . . . . . . 7
Definition of Model State Plan Characteristics . . . . . . . 8

CHAPTER II--ANALYSIS OF STATE PLANS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 11
Instrument Development . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 11
Procedures . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 11
Results of Assessments . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 12
Rating Across States on Each Element . . . . . . . . . . . . 12
Summary Across States by Elements and Criteria . . . . . . . 16
Overall Rating by State . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 32

CHAPTER III--PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS ENCOUNTERED IN DEVELOPING STATE PLANS FOR CAREER EDUCATION. . . . . . . . . 34
Summary. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 39

CHAPTER IV--ANALYSIS OF STATUS OF CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION AND PLANNED IMPLEMENTATION OF STATE PLANS FOR CAREER EDUCATION . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 41
Telephone Interviews . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 41
Procedures . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 42
Group One Inquiry: Status of Plan Objectives . . . . . . . 42
Group Two Inquiry: General Status of Career Education in the State . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 42
Results and Discussion . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 43
Group One: Status of Plan Objectives . . . . . . . . . . . 43
Group Two: General Status of Career Education in the State . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 46
Implications . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 48

CHAPTER V--SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 50
Summary. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 50
Conclusions. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 51

APPENDIX A
- Letter to State Coordinators of Career Education Accompanying Draft Assessment Reports . . . . . . . . . A-1
- Assessment Report Form. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . A-3
- Guidelines for Applying Criteria to Assessment of State Plans. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . A-14

## Chapter 1

## PROCEDURES

This document is the final report of a career education study conducted by the Southwest Regional Laboratory (SWRL) under contract to the U. S. Office of Education (USOE). The purpose of this study was to provide for each state submitting a state plan for career education to the Office of Career Education a written assessment of the degree to which the plan complied with the requirements of P.L. 93-380. These assessments were intended to furnish direction to the states for revision and refinement of their plans.

The major tasks of the study were to:

- develop criteria for evaluating the state plans
- visit a representative sample of states to learn about problems encountered and solutions attempted during development of state plans
- analyze state plans
- determine states' readiness for implementation of state plans
- develop guidelines for state plan compliance with P.L. 95-207
- develop a model for refining state plans
- prepare a final report

Procedures for and results of each of these tasks are presented in this report.

### Development of Criteria for Assessing State Plans for Career Education

Preliminary Tasks. A primary task of this study was to develop a set of criteria against which state plans for career education would be assessed. Since states had developed their plans with grant assistance from P.L. 93-380 and since OCE had sponsored and monitored the grant programs, the first task of the project staff was to visit OCE to secure copies of state plans that had already been submitted and to obtain information about the documents and technical assistance that had been provided to the states during the course of their plan development. Project staff also met with the OCE project officer who had monitored development of the state plans and with the officer of the current project at the Office of Evaluation and Dissemination (OED). Discussion probed the extent of technical assistance provided the states during plan development and identified reasonable expectations for satisfaction of specific criteria in the plans.

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) had also provided materials and technical assistance to the states during the period of plan development. Therefore, CCSSO was also visited by project staff. Copies of all materials that had been provided to the states, and agenda and content of each staff development meeting presented for state coordinators were obtained and analyzed to identify elements and criteria that states could be expected to address in their plans.

The project director made a presentation to the National Advisory Council for Career Education at its regular meeting in September. After describing the purposes, procedures, and intended outcomes of this project, the project director met with individual state coordinators of career education to answer their questions and to begin to develop an awareness of the coordinators' perceptions of their tasks in plan development.

Literature Search. In addition to the above activities, the project staff conducted an extensive literature search in order to identify elements and criteria beyond those explicated in the materials made available to the state coordinators by OCE and CCSSO. Elements were defined as major components that a plan should contain, such as a statement of the state's philosophy, conceptual base, and definition of career education; the state's approach to needs assessment; a statement of objectives; a statement of planned strategies for reaching these objectives; etc. Criteria were defined as those specifics an element would need to include in order to adequately address the component.

Descriptors used in the literature search were needs assessment, educational needs, educational planning, educational policy, state plans, dissemination, adoption/adaption of plans, implementation and evaluation, and career education. Sources of literature included ERIC, Smithsonian Science Information Exchange, documents referenced in the RFP, documents referenced in materials provided to coordinators by OCE and CCSSO, Education Index, Psychological Abstracts, project reports (OCE, NIE, BOAE), Journal abstracts, works of key authors (e.g., Gene Glass, Steven Jung, N. L. McCaslin, James Popham, Daniel Stufflebeam, Belle Ruth Witkin, Blain Worthen), and interviews with key professionals and business/industry representatives. Two hundred fifty-nine documents were selected for review.

Twenty elements were used as organizers to guide the literature review. Ten elements were prescribed by P.L. 93-380, six by P.L. 95-207, and four were identified by the project staff during proposal preparation and during preliminary literature review. Some adjustments in the P.L.-related elements were made. For instance, since staff development appeared in the literature in relation to almost all elements, and since it is relevant to every aspect of planning, the staff felt it appropriate to designate staff development a separate element. Similarly, in the first phase of the literature review counseling and guidance emerged so strongly that it seemed more appropriate to designate it an element than to maintain it as a criterion subsumed under strategies. It is interesting to note, however, that the related but non-career-education literature did not show as heavy an emphasis on counseling and guidance as might have been expected. The career education literature appeared more likely than the educational planning literature, to address counseling and guidance. The professionals interviewed, however, each independently supported the designation of counseling and guidance as a discrete element.

A number of elements were heavily represented in the career education literature provided by OCE and CCSSO. These included needs assessment, objectives, implementation, evaluation, and staff development. It would be expected that such elements would receive heavy treatment since they represent major considerations in developing an effective plan in any area of education. None of the external reviewers felt that any elements were missing from the list of 20; they did add some criteria, and did clarify or refocus the emphasis of some criteria.

The plethora of career education literature on planning (needs assessment, goal statements, strategy selection and evaluation) appeared to be rather narrowly conceived, making few excursions into the administrative areas such as the actual administration of the plan, assurances, dissemination, etc. Project staff had to seek other sources to identify adequate criteria in some of these areas.

Literature on general educational planning, implementation, dissemination and accountability tended to be less local-program-specific than the career education literature. Although some of the more frequently addressed criteria found in career education literature appeared also in related literature, a substantial number of criteria appeared only in one or the other type of document. The general educational planning literature was more diffuse in its coverage, whereas the career education literature tended to reemphasize certain specific criteria. This may be a function of the shared perception of importance of the specific criteria, or it may be a function of inbreeding of concepts among career educators.

Most of the career education literature focused on criteria that may be more important for local plans than for state plans. These differences were reconciled as the staff progressed with refinement activities. Analysis reflected variance within elements in terms of specificity, quality and philosophic base. While some criteria were generic (e.g., addresses national needs and societal concerns), other criteria were very specific to the document reviewed (e.g., provides key roles for all professional educators). Other variance occurs in the quality of criteria. For example, the strategies element includes the following criteria, "Builds on strategies that are part of other programs," and "Includes strategies for program initiation on a small scale, with subsequent expansion." The first criterion is vague and provides little direction. The second is directive but reflects a specific philosophy about implementation. If one state supports that philosophy, the direction is helpful. If another state does not support the philosophy, the criterion is inappropriate to development of their plan.

One hundred fifty-six criteria were identified in the literature provided and/or recommended to state coordinators by OCE and CCSSO. More than one hundred additional criteria emerged from the general literature search, many of them supported by reasonable rationales. Figure 1 reflects the 20 original elements, the number of criteria subsumed under each and the sources of these criteria; and the appearance of rationales for these criteria in the literature.

Reviewers commented on the range and number of criteria, and agreed that considerable synthesis and refinement would be needed before the list was ready to be applied in assessment of state plans. For example, there were more than 30 criteria that related to needs assessment. The staff had to decide at what point the number of criteria became prohibitive, and how many criteria were sufficient to direct development of an objective means for evaluating state plans. Project staff consolidated those that represented the same concept, rewording to capture the essence of the meaning of the several appearances of the criterion. This reduced the list considerably and made it somewhat more manageable.

First steps in consolidation of elements and criteria were accomplished at a meeting of the National Advisory Panel and the project officer with the project staff at SWRL. Further work of the project staff resulted in a number of the elements being subsumed under others. For instance, whereas counseling and guidance had emerged as an element during the literature review, the eventual consensus was that counseling and guidance is a delivery system that should be subsumed under strategies. It represents a very important criterion under strategies, and illustrates the fact that some of the criteria are much more crucial than others. The project staff suggested, and the project officer agreed, that some criteria would need to be weighted more heavily than others when applied to assessment of state plans. Since counseling and guidance is one of the criteria that appears in the Law and its rules and regulations, a state plan that did not include a strong counseling and guidance component in its strategies could not be considered to have met the requirements of the law.

The refined list of elements and criteria was sent to the project officer, to the National Advisory Panel, and to selected state coordinators for review and reaction. Reactions to the document caused the project staff to question the appropriateness of including in the assessment of state plans any elements or criteria that had not appeared in P.L. 93-380 or its rules and regulations. Site visits to six states and discussion with those state coordinators and other persons who had participated in the development of the plans in those states confirmed the prudence of limiting the assessment of state plans to law-specific items. A final iteration of the list of elements and criteria was approved by the project officer and the OCE representative. This list appears in Appendix A as Assessment Report Form.

It was agreed that criteria whose importance was supported by the literature review, but which did not appear in P.L. 93-380 or its rules and regulations, would be included in the model state plan characteristics.

Figure 1. Composite Matrix Showing the Interception of Characteristics/Elements, Criteria and Assumptions/Rationales in Materials Provided by OCE and CCSSO and Related Literature.

| CRITERIA NUMBER | C/E A | A/R | C/E B | A/R | C/E C | A/R | C/E C' | A/R | C/E D | A/R | C/E E | A/R | C/E F | A/R | C/E G | A/R | C/E H | A/R | C/E I | A/R | C/E J | A/R | C/E K | A/R | C/E L | A/R | C/E M | A/R | C/E N | A/R | C/E O | A/R | C/E P | A/R | C/E Q | A/R | C/E R | A/R | C/E S | A/R |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | O | O | ⊗* | O | ⊗ | O | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗* | ⊗ | ⊗* | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ | O | ⊗ |  | ⊗* | O | ⊗ |  | O |  | O |  | O | O |  |  | ⊗* |  | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗* | ⊗ | O |  | ⊗ |  |
| 2. | ⊗ | O | ⊗* | ⊗ | O |  | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ | O | ⊗ |  | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ | O |  | ⊗* | O | ⊗ | X | O |  | O |  | ⊗* | O |  |  | ⊗* |  | O | O | ⊗ |  | O |  | ⊗ |  |
| 3. | O |  | ⊗* | ⊗ | O |  |  |  | ⊗ | ⊗ | O |  | ⊗ | ⊗ | X |  | O | O | O | O | ⊗ |  | O |  |  | O | O | O |  |  | ⊗* |  | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ |  | O |  | ⊗ |  |
| 4. | ⊗ | X | O | X |  |  |  |  | O |  | ⊗ | O | ⊗ | O | X | X | O | O |  |  | ⊗ |  | O |  | O |  | O | O |  |  | O |  | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ | O | O | ⊗ |  |
| 5. | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ |  |  |  |  |  | O |  | ⊗ |  | ⊗ | O | X |  | X* |  |  |  |  |  | O |  | X |  | O |  |  |  |  |  | O | O | X | X | O |  | ⊗ |  |
| 6. | ⊗ | O | ⊗ | O |  |  |  |  | O | O | O |  | ⊗ | O | X |  |  |  |  |  | ⊗ | ⊗ | O |  |  |  | ⊗ |  |  |  |  |  | O |  | X |  | X | X | ⊗ |  |
| 7. | ⊗* | O | ⊗ | X |  |  |  |  | O | O | O | O | O | O | X |  |  |  |  |  | ⊗ |  | O |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | O |  | X |  | X | X | ⊗ |  |
| 8. | X |  | ⊗ | O |  |  |  |  | O |  | O |  | ⊗ |  | X* |  |  |  |  |  | O |  | O |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ⊗ | X | X |  | X | X | ⊗ |  |
| 9. | X* |  | ⊗ |  |  |  |  |  | O |  | O | O | ⊗ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | O | O | X | X | X |  | ⊗ |  |
| 10. |  |  | ⊗ |  |  |  |  |  | O |  | ⊗ | ⊗ |  | O |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | O |  | X | X |  |  | ⊗ |  |
| 11. |  |  | O |  |  |  |  |  | O |  | ⊗ | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | O | O | X | X |  |  | ⊗ |  |
| 12. |  |  | O |  |  |  |  |  | O |  | X | X | O |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | O |  | X |  |  |  | ⊗ |  |
| 13. |  |  | ⊗ |  |  |  |  |  | O |  | X | X |  | O |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ⊗ |  |  |  |  |  | ⊗ |  |
| 14. |  |  | ⊗ |  |  |  |  |  | O |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | O |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15. |  |  | ⊗ |  |  |  |  |  | O |  | X | X | O | O |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ⊗ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16. |  |  | ⊗ |  |  |  |  |  | O |  |  |  | ⊗ | O |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ⊗ | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17. |  |  | ⊗ |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18. |  |  | O |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19. |  |  | ⊗ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20. |  |  | ⊗ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21. |  |  | ⊗ | ⊗ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22. |  |  | O |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23. |  |  | O |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24. |  |  | O |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25. |  |  | ⊗ | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26. |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27. |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28. |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29. |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30. |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 31. |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32. |  |  | X* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 33. |  |  | X* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

A. Career education definition and conceptual base.

B. Needs Assessment

C. Current program assessment

C'. Discrepancy Analysis

D. Objectives

E. Implementation

F. Evaluation

G. Dissemination

H. Funding

I. Relationship to postsecondary, adult education

J. SEA Administration

K. Objectives states will achieve at end of each of the funded years.

L. Describes projected use of federal funds.

M. Addresses legal, social content requirements

N. Assures meeting requirements of Section 6 of PL 95-207

O. Provides evaluation criteria to Commissioner

P. Guidelines for staff development

Q. Planning processes

R. Career guidance, placement, counseling and follow-up

S. Technical aspects

Legend:
O - From OCE and CCSSO material
X - from related literature
* - input from Advisory Panel

Defining the Elements. Although the elements that remained in the final list all were contained in P.L. 93-380 and most of the criteria could be found either in the law or in its rules and regulations, there remained the task of interpretation. For instance, what constitutes "evaluation of career education inputs?" In defining the parameters of each criterion, the staff referred again to the findings of the literature search. Consensus was not easy, as conflicting views were espoused by various authors and staff members. When definitions were completed, all staff members applied them independently to the review of three state plans to determine whether all were interpreting the definitions consistently. Further discussion resulted in refinement of definitions, and use of an item scaling technique and interrater reliability was established at the .89 level, tabulating percentage of classification agreements on each criterion and percentage of agreement by element.

## Site Visitations

One of the project tasks was to conduct site visits to six SEAs. The principal purpose of the site visits was to provide project staff experience in comparing what they had understood from a written project plan with what they learned in discussion with a range of persons when visiting the developers of the plan. This was more a validation of the staff's ability to interpret the written plans than of the degree to which the plans reflected what had actually happened in the states. A second important purpose of the site visits was to learn more about the processes states used in developing their plans. Written plans tend to mask the extent of effort required to develop them and to ignore the many problems encountered in the process.

In selecting states for site visits, the staff developed profiles of each of the 50 states, using publications made available by CCSSO and the National Center for Education Statistics. States were then arrayed in a matrix which grouped the states according to specific characteristics, e.g., geographical region, state population and population density, governance structure, population characteristics (types and percents of minorities), state wealth, etc. With the help of the project officer, six states were selected representing various configurations of these characteristics. States visited were Wisconsin, California, New Mexico, Alabama, Iowa, and Wyoming.

Project staff developed a protocol for each site visit based principally on review of the state's plan. Besides specific questions related to the plan, the protocol explored general areas such as processes used in development of the plan, problems encountered, and solutions attempted. The protocol was discussed with the coordinators of the six states by telephone before the visits, and coordinators were asked to have available for interview those persons most able to respond to the various areas of inquiry.

The deputy director of the project contacted each of the six states by telephone to arrange the site visits, and followed up with a letter.

The project director and the USOE project officer accompanied the two-member site visit team on the first visit in order to observe the adequacy of the protocol and procedures and to assist the team in modification for future visits.

All personnel hosting site visits were cooperative and helpful. The site visit team applied information from the site visits to refinement and definition of elements and criteria, to the development of the document on Model State Plan Characteristics, and to preparation of a report on problems encountered and solutions attempted in the development of state plans.

## Analysis of Final Project Reports

Final project reports submitted with state plans for career education to OCE were analyzed to identify problems and solutions reported by states in the development of their plans. Thirty-eight final project reports were available for analysis. Eleven states that submitted state plans were telephoned to request that their final project report be sent to SWRL for analysis. No additional reports were received, however.

## Conversations with State Career Education Coordinators

Throughout the project, staff were in contact with state career education coordinators. For example, staff telephoned each coordinator to verify receipt of the draft state plan assessment report (see Chapter II). Staff also talked to coordinators during the conduct of the implementation status survey (see Chapter IV). The Project Director also discussed the project goals and procedures during meetings with coordinators. In each activity noted above, coordinators discussed, among other issues, concerns related to development of the state plans and the circumstances surrounding use of P.L. 93-380 funds for such development.

## Development of Guidelines for P.L. 95-207

Although the major focus of the project was assessment of state plans as developed under P.L. 93-380, the fact that plans to be submitted to OCE by July 1, 1979 for funding under the Career Education Incentive Act (P.L. 95-207) would need to reflect the requirements of that Act required additional attention from project staff. The staff analyzed P.L. 95-207 and its rules and regulations just as it had analyzed P.L. 93-380. Since many of the elements required by P.L. 95-207 parallel those required by P.L. 93-380, the project staff prepared a document for P.L. 95-207 paralleling the format of the elements and criteria for state plans developed under P.L. 93-380, and indicating P.L. 95-207 requirements that are different from or in addition to those of P.L. 93-380. It was felt that drawing parallels between the two laws would facilitate states' attempts to recast their plans to meet the requirements of P.L. 95-207. For a few of the elements, no changes or additions were required, but for most elements, revisions were necessary. A copy of the elements and criteria for P.L. 95-207 appears in Appendix B.

The project staff also developed guidelines for meeting each criterion that is unique to P.L. 95-207. The guidelines, along with a letter encouraging the states to include these criteria in their state plan revisions, was mailed to each state and territory. A copy of the guidelines and of the letter appear in Appendix B. Feedback from states concerning these guidelines was uniformly positive, with 25 states sending letters to project staff acknowledging the value of the guidelines. In addition, during telephone interviews with state coordinators of career education later in the project, most states volunteered the information that the guidelines for compliance with P.L. 95-207, as developed by the project staff, were very helpful.

As revised plans and addenda were received it was obvious that in addition to complying with P.L. 93-380, most states were also diligently applying the guidelines for P.L. 95-207.

## Definition of Model State Plan Characteristics

The RFP called for development of a model state plan. At the first meeting with the project officer and the National Advisory Panel, part of the discussion revolved around the purpose, content, and format of such a model. The group decided that writing an actual state plan that would meet all desirable elements and criteria might be more misleading than helpful. In order to develop a consistent document the staff would have to define a hypothetical 51st state and make all parts of the plan appropriate for that state. Since the state would be hypothetical, the plans so developed would not be appropriate for any existing state; yet, there was some concern that states might think that this was a recipe or blueprint and might adopt it without the modification necessary to make it appropriate for that state. It was also agreed that examples alone do not provide sufficient directions for generating a product. It was therefore decided that a set of guidelines was needed that would define the characteristics of an ideal state plan and explain how to develop a plan with those components. Rationales for each characteristic would also be presented.

In the proposal, the project staff had suggested developing the model state plan as a guide to assessment of the state plans for career education. However, when it became obvious that that assessment would need to be confined largely to the elements and criteria for P.L. 93-380, the focus of the model plan changed. After discussion with the project officer and the National Advisory Panel, the final decision was to develop a document entitled "Model State Plan Characteristics: A Guide for Refining State Plans for Career Education."

Format of the Document. Since the project staff had already developed an effective format for displaying elements, criteria, and guidelines, both for P.L. 93-380 and P.L. 95-207, it appeared that this would be a good format to follow for the model state plan. The first draft of the document was developed in that format. However, it became evident that, whereas the format was ideal to use as a template for assessing a state plan and determining what element of the state plan needed improvement, it was not an ideal format for providing direction in refining plans that had already been developed. The emphasis on sections according to elements tended to obscure the necessity for interrelating the various parts of the plan.

The revised document is a planning model rather than a model state plan. It presents model state plan characteristics, and guidelines which an individual or team at the SEA level could follow in developing a state plan. At the same time it lends itself to consideration by those whose plans are already developed. It would be comparatively easy for a plan developer to measure his/her plan against the guidelines for any component to determine the adequacy of treatment of that component.

Content of the Document. Although legislative mandates have caused states to develop state plans (e.g., Vocational Education, Special Education, Title I), review of the literature and assessment of state plans for career education convinced the project staff that there is a need for a document that explains characteristics of a model state plan, presents rationales for these characteristics, and provides examples and guidelines to help state personnel refine their state plans for career education.

The document is arranged around the characteristics included in a model state plan. Specification and definition of those characteristics basic to a consistent and functional plan were the result of this project's literature search; analysis of Public Laws 93-380 and 95-207; assessment of 49 state plans for career education; discussions with state planners by telephone and during site visits; telephone interviews with coordinators of career education; meetings of the National Advisory Panel; input of the project officer; and project staff experience and expertise.

Although the characteristics generally parallel the elements defined in P.L. 93-380 and 95-207, definitions of some of these characteristics differ from the criteria derived from the two Public Laws and their rules and regulations. The most important feature of the document in terms of its potential impact on career education is the fact that it stresses the importance of relationships and linkages among and between the various characteristics.

For instance, the statement of the state's philosophy/definition/conceptual base for career education frames all other sections. The needs assessment, the objectives, the strategies, the evaluation--even the funding--all relate to this statement. Failure to build in these relationships results in an inconsistent and/or nonfunctional plan that defies evaluation.

Examples included in the document are reflections of the best treatment of each characteristic in the 49 state plans assessed. This feature assures states that this is not an "ivory tower" model, but rather a compilation of the best reality of already developed state plans.

"Model State Plan Characteristics: A guide for Refining State Plans for Career Education," is designed to help state coordinators of career education in further refinement of their state plans. Because of its length and its potential usefulness it appears as a separate document instead of being incorporated into this report. A limited number of copies of the document, plus camera-ready copy to facilitate further reproduction, have been submitted to the Office of Evaluation and Dissemination.

# Chapter II

## ANALYSIS OF STATE PLANS

As state plans were submitted to OCE they were forwarded to SWRL where they were catalogued. All state plans received by June 30, 1979 are included in the tabulations reported in this Chapter. The list of included plans represents 44 states, the District of Columbia, and 4 territories, for a total of 49. Three state plans received after June 30 were assessed, and assessments were reported to their state coordinators of career education, but are not included in this report.

### Instrument Development

A requirement of the RFP was that an objective instrument be developed for use in assessing the state plans according to the final list of elements and criteria. As indicated in Chapter II, the project staff began by defining each criterion and by independently assessing the same three state plans, using these definitions, to determine whether the definitions communicated and were interpreted consistently by all staff members. Further efforts to objectify the process resulted in application of an item scaling technique to develop an instrument for use in assessments. A copy of the instrument appears in Appendix A as Guidelines for Applying Criteria to Assessment of State Plans.

### Procedures

The entire staff independently rated two additional state plans and found that with the new objective instrument interrater realiability was at .89 (see Chapter I). From that point on, each state plan was reviewed by two staff members. In each case, one staff member had primary responsibility (which included preparation of the assessment report) and the other had secondary responsibility (including reconciliation, through a third project staff member if necessary) of any discrepancies between that person's ratings and those of the primary reviewer. The reporting form reflected a rating of strong, adequate, or weak on each criterion with a five point scale ranging from strong to weak summarizing the overall rating for each element. A section for comments was used to commend states for particularly exemplary sections or to suggest improvements when a criterion had not been adequately met.

The project staff assessed the state plans in the order in which they were received, and prepared a report of the assessment. A copy of each report was sent to the coordinator of career education for that state along with a letter asking the coordinator to review the assessment report and to contact project staff within two weeks if there were any inaccuracies or omissions. (A copy of this letter appears in Appendix A.) Reports were designed to help states identify areas in which their state plans fell short of the requirements of P.L. 93-380, and to provide information regarding what was needed to meet the requirements. No reports of the individual assessments were submitted to OED or OCE.

## Results of Assessments

Assessments of the originally submitted state plans for career education indicated pervasive weaknesses, with average ratings below "adequate" in six of the eleven elements. These were: funding/budget, needs assessments, plans for implementation and administration, dissemination, evaluation, and career education efforts to date. When reports of these assessments were submitted to coordinators of career education for review many reacted quickly and wrote or telephoned project staff expressing concern. Although a few indicated that the criteria were too rigid, most of the states agreed that the assessments had been fair and that the assistance provided by the staff in the report was valuable. With the approval of the project officer and OCE, project staff encouraged states to strengthen their plans on those criteria which had been rated weak. Twenty-eight states responded with revisions and/or addenda.

The agreed upon procedure was to finalize the assessment reports as soon as the coordinators had had an opportunity to review them and to verify their accuracy and completeness. Final reports of assessments were to be sent to the coordinator and to the coordinator's chief state school officer. When it became evident that many states wanted to refine their plans to bring them into compliance with P.L. 93-380, the project extended timelines to give coordinators time to revise their plans or to submit addenda. Coordinators were instructed to submit revised plans or addenda to OCE as well as to project staff in order for the submissions to be considered official. As the revised plans or addenda were received, the primary project reviewer of each state plan reviewed the new submissions and revised the assessment reports as appropriate. Revised and finalized assessment reports were then submitted to the coordinator of career education of each state and to the coordinator's chief state school officer. Refinements and/or additions to the original plans resulted in improved element ratings for 25 of the 28 states submitting revisions or addenda.

### Rating Across States on Each Element

Forty-nine state and territory plans for career education were assessed relative to the degree to which they reflected the elements and criteria developed by project staff. Results of both original drafts and revised plans are presented in terms of: a summary of all states on each element; a summary of all states on the criteria of each element; and, the overall rating of each state.

A frequency count was made on each element according to the number of states that received a rating at each point of the five-point scale (5 = Strong). From these frequencies, a mean rating was determined to reflect average rating on that element. Two mean ratings were determined for each state; a mean for the draft versions and a mean rating for final versions of the plans (which included revisions/addenda submitted by 28 states). Results of these computations appear in Table 1.

It can be seen from Table 1 that, on draft versions, states averaged the highest ratings on element A, Definition and conceptual base (3.18) and element D, Objectives for the one- and five-year plans (3.35). Thirty-seven states were rated adequate or above on element A. Thirty-seven states were rated adequate or above on element D. This would seem to indicate that many states adequately understand and articulate basic career education concepts, present them in a comprehensive definition, and specify career education objectives that are consistent with the concepts.

Table 1 also reveals that draft plans received lowest ratings on elements B, H, and J (Needs Assessment, Budget, and Administration, respectively). States appear to have had difficulty meeting the criteria for determining needs. In discussions with state coordinators, the most common reason presented for this difficulty was lack of sufficient funds and time to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment. Many states also treated their budget very broadly and generally. No common reason for this broad approach was given. With respect to element J, Administration of the plan by the SEA, the most common difficulty reflected lack of management and administration strategies to monitor implementation of the plan.

Table 1 also reveals that mean ratings on all elements increased notably between the draft and final versions of state plans. On every element mean rating increased. In all but one element, improvement resulted in a mean rating of at least 3.0, or adequate. Again, the highest mean ratings can be found on elements A (3.61) and D (3.63). Elements on which states received lowest ratings were element B (3.22), C (3.14), H (2.94) and J (3.04). It is interesting to note that, even though states received the lowest ratings on these elements, states showed the greatest increase in rating between draft and final version on element B (.69 increase) and element H (.70 increase).

## Table 1

### Summary Across States for All Elements[1]

| Element | Scale* 5 Strong | 4 | 3 Adequate | 2 | 1 Weak | $\bar{X}$ Rating | Net Increase |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. Presents SEA's definition of career education and the conceptual base upon which career education in the State rests. | 3<br>6 | 18<br>23 | 16<br>15 | 9<br>5 | 3<br>0 | 3.18<br>3.61 | .43 |
| B. Describes the need for career education within the State. | 1<br>5 | 11<br>13 | 12<br>21 | 14<br>8 | 11<br>2 | 2.53<br>3.22 | .69 |
| C. Describes the State's career education efforts and accomplishments to date to meet those needs identified in (B), including an assessment of existing programs, practices, and materials. | 6<br>6 | 7<br>10 | 12<br>21 | 19<br>9 | 5<br>3 | 2.80<br>3.14 | .34 |
| D. Specifies the objectives the State will seek to achieve in implementing career education within the State for 1977-78, and for each year 1978-79 through 1981-82. | 8<br>10 | 15<br>17 | 14<br>17 | 10<br>4 | 2<br>1 | 3.35<br>3.63 | .28 |
| E. Sets forth the strategies, activities, and resources to be utilized in implementing the one- and five-year plans in the following areas: (a) presents curriculum which reflects the effect/benefit of career education on experiential learning outside of the school building and on vocational education; (b) includes plans for career counseling, guidance, placement, and follow-up; (c) provides for meeting the career education needs of special groups, including the handicapped and other educationally disadvantaged students, and for eliminating the stereotyping of career opportunities by race or by sex; (d) provides for involvement of the business/labor/industry/professional/government community in Career Education; (e) provides for involving the home and family structure in career education; (f) provides for training and retraining, both pre- and in-service, for personnel to enable them to implement career education. | 7<br>7 | 8<br>13 | 17<br>19 | 15<br>9 | 2<br>1 | 3.06<br>3.33 | .27 |
| F. Specifies the plans for evaluating the effectiveness of career education inputs, processes, and outcomes in local education agencies and in personnel training programs. | 2<br>4 | 10<br>12 | 17<br>25 | 15<br>8 | 5<br>0 | 2.78<br>3.24 | .46 |

[1] Summary includes territories.

*Top Number = Number of state plans receiving that rating on draft version. N = 49
Bottom Number = Number of state plans receiving that rating on final version. N = 49, of which 28 plans included some revision or addition; 21 remained the same as the draft version.

Table I (Cont.)

| Element | Scale | | | | | | Net Increase |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 5 Strong | 4 | 3 Adequate | 2 | 1 Weak | $\overline{X}$ Rating | |
| G. Specifies plans for disseminating information about career education, career education practices, and products, and the results of career education efforts to interested persons within the State. | $\frac{4}{4}$ | $\frac{10}{16}$ | $\frac{15}{19}$ | $\frac{11}{8}$ | $\frac{9}{2}$ | $\frac{2.78}{3.24}$ | .46 |
| H. Specifies the funding that will be needed to implement the various components of the one year and five year plans and the sources of the necessary funding, where these sources are available. | $\frac{7}{10}$ | $\frac{4}{6}$ | $\frac{8}{15}$ | $\frac{5}{7}$ | $\frac{25}{11}$ | $\frac{2.24}{2.94}$ | .70 |
| I. Shows relationship of the State Plan for Career Education to career education activities being carried out and contemplated in post-secondary and adult education settings. | $\frac{3}{4}$ | $\frac{12}{17}$ | $\frac{16}{21}$ | $\frac{14}{5}$ | $\frac{4}{2}$ | $\frac{2.92}{3.33}$ | .41 |
| J. Specifies the manner in which the plan is to be implemented and administered by the SEA, which: (a) includes allocation of resources; (b) includes management of activities; (c) includes provision of assistance to others within the State; (d) includes staffing for career education within the SEA; (e) includes relationship of the plan to other planning efforts at the State level. | $\frac{2}{2}$ | $\frac{10}{13}$ | $\frac{14}{21}$ | $\frac{18}{11}$ | $\frac{2}{2}$ | $\frac{2.65}{3.04}$ | .39 |

## Summary Across States by Elements and Criteria

Results of ratings of all draft and final state plans were summarized for criteria of each element. In rating state plans on each criterion, a three-point scale was used. Criteria developed by project staff represented characteristics that could be specifically stated in a plan. For purposes of rating, criteria were considered met only when they were explicitly stated in whichever section addressed the element. The results of the ratings are presented in Tables 2-12. The top number refers to the number of draft state plans receiving a rating at that point of the scale. The bottom number refers to the number of final state plans receiving that rating.

Element A. Table 2 presents a summary of the draft and final ratings of all state plans for the criteria under element A, Definition and conceptual base. It can be seen from Table 2 that, with the exception of criteria lb, lc and lh, most states were rated adequate or strong on their draft plans on this element. More than one-half of the states (25) were rated "Weak" on lb; 30 states were rated "Weak" on lc; and 20 states were rated "Weak" on lh. Analysis of the state plans indicated that most states treated the concepts represented by lb and lc by reference to "all children." This was intended to include handicapped and other educationally disadvantaged students. Such intention was borne out by the fact that most states that used "all children" in the definition devoted specific objectives to handicapped and other educationally disadvantaged students. In such cases, project staff recommended that special populations be specifically mentioned in the definition so that it is clear that the state plans to include these in the process and outcomes of their career education programs.

Table 2 also reveals that 20 states did not address the need for students to learn to cope with accelerated change and obsolescence (lh). Analysis of state plans indicated that, while plans generally addressed the needs for flexibility in attitudes, skills and knowledge, they did not specifically address accelerated change and obsolescence. Comparing ratings of draft and final plans on lb, lc and lh indicates that a number of states attended to these criteria in their revisions.

States were particularly strong in: identifying career education as a systematic, continuous sequence (la); relating the subject matter of the curricula of the schools to the needs of individuals to function fully in society (le); treating career education as cutting across the entire curriculum (li); and presenting major learner outcomes (lj).

A number of states included a glossary in the definition and conceptual base section of their plan. Such a practice provides those who will use the plan a clearer understanding of key concepts used throughout the plan. This practice is recommended for all states.

Table 2

Summary Across States for Element A

| Element/Criteria | Scale* | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Strong | Adequate | Weak |
| A. Presents SEA's definition of career education and the conceptual base upon which career education in the state rests. | | | |
| 1. Definition and conceptual base include the following concepts and characteristics: | | | |
| a. identifying career education as a systematic, continuous sequence . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 28/28 | 18/[illegible] | 3/1 |
| b. identifying goal of preparing all children and youth, including handicapped and all other children who are educationally disadvantaged, for full participation in the society in which they are to live and work . . . . . . . . . . . | 13/16 | 11/16 | 25/17 |
| c. providing career guidance and career development for all children including those with special needs, minority and educationally disadvantaged. | 4/6 | 15/20 | 30/23 |
| d. increasing collaborative relationships between schools and society as a whole . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 7/9 | 27/30 | 15/10 |
| e. relating subject matter of the curricula of schools to the needs of individuals to function fully in society . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 29/31 | 16/14 | 4/4 |
| f. eliminating distinction between vocational and general and academic education . . . . . . . . | 21/23 | 13/15 | 15/11 |
| g. extending the education process beyond the school into the areas of employment and the community . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 20/22 | 22/22 | 7/5 |
| h. fostering flexibility in attitudes, skills, and knowledge in order to enable persons to cope with accelerated change and obsolescence . . . | 16/17 | 13/16 | 20/16 |
| i. treating career education as cutting across the entire curriculum, including basic skills, fine arts, practical arts, academic education, and vocational education . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 27/28 | 18/18 | 4/3 |
| j. identifying major desired learner outcomes . . . | 30/34 | 18/14 | 1/1 |

Scale: 5 4 3 2 1

Element A: strong — adequate — weak

| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D = | 3 | 18 | 16 | 9 | 3 | $\overline{X}$ = 3.18 |
| F = | 6 | 23 | 15 | 5 | 0 | $\overline{X}$ = 3.61 |

*Top Number = Number of draft state plans receiving that rating.
Bottom Number = Number of final state plans receiving that rating.

N = 49

Element B. Criteria from P.L. 93-380 for element B (Needs assessment) were supplemented by criteria interpreted from "An Analysis of Needs Assessment Techniques for Educational Planning at State, Intermediate and District Levels" by Belle Ruth Witkin. This document had been provided to all state coordinators by the Office of Career Education. These criteria constituted six of the eleven criteria for element B. However, in computing ratings for the elements, these criteria were not weighted as heavily as those drawn from P.L. 93-380 and its rules and regulations. (See comments on weighting in Chapter I, p. 4.)

Table 3 presents the draft and final plan results for element B. It can be seen from Table 3 that 25 draft plans were rated below adequate on this element. Table 3 also shows that over one-half (31) of the states did not report assessment of the needs of all students in the elementary, middle/junior high, and high schools of the state in their draft plans (criterion 2). Twenty-three draft plans were judged weak with respect to identifying the sources of content of items for needs assessment instruments (6). Twenty-four states did not include assessment of resources needed to implement the plan (7). Twenty-three states did not include parents, educators, business, industry, labor, government agencies (8) as populations in the needs assessment.

During discussions with coordinators, several explanations were repeatedly presented for not assessing the needs of all students and for not including parents, labor, industry, etc. in the assessment.

1. A number of coordinators objected to the inclusion of criteria from Witkin because such criteria were not explicit in P.L. 93-380 or in the rules and regulations.

2. Some coordinators mentioned that there was not sufficient time or money to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment.

3. Some coordinators noted that LEAs were already concerned about excessive assessments. (Some states are beginning to incorporate questions of interest concerning career education into existing data collection programs to help overcome this complaint.)

Comparison of the draft and final ratings of state plans on the criteria noted above indicates noticable improvement. For example, draft ratings show 31 state plans rated weak on criterion 2, whereas only 19 final state plans were still judged weak. Similar statements can be made for criteria 6, 7 and 8. One potential explanation for such improvement can be found in the addenda supplied by states. Project staff had reported to state coordinators that insufficient information was presented on these criteria in draft plans. Coordinators responded by submitting additional documentation. Thus, it appears that some states had such supporting evidence but had not adequately reported it in the draft plan.

### Table 3

### Summary Across States for Element B

| Element/Criteria | Scale* | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | strong | adequate | weak |
| B. Describes the need for career education within the State. | | | |
| 1. Reflects State's definition of career education in content of needs assessment instruments . . . . . . . | 26<br>28 | 13<br>16 | 10<br>5 |
| 2. Reflects assessment of the career education needs of all students in the elementary, middle/junior high, and senior high schools of the State, including the special needs of handicapped and other educationally disadvantaged students . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 9<br>13 | 9<br>17 | 31<br>19 |
| 3. Reflects assessment of needs for pre- and in-service staff development . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 12<br>14 | 17<br>25 | 20<br>10 |
| 4. Describes procedures used in the needs assessment . | 11<br>12 | 27<br>31 | 11<br>6 |
| 5. Describes relationship of any prior needs assessment efforts and results to determination of current needs . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 17***<br>21 | 10<br>12 | 13<br>7 |
| **6.[1] Specifies sources from which content of items for needs assessment instruments were derived or sources from which the instruments themselves were obtained . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 14<br>18 | 12<br>17 | 23<br>14 |
| **7. Includes assessment of resources (financial, human, technological, and material) needed for implementation of the Plan . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 8<br>12 | 17<br>21 | 24<br>16 |
| **8. Includes students, parents, educators, business, industry, labor, government agencies as populations responding to the needs assessment instruments . . . | 17<br>21 | 9<br>12 | 23<br>16 |
| **9. Uses available data (e.g., public opinion polls, research, demographic data, etc.) . . . . . . . . . | 12<br>15 | 17<br>19 | 20<br>15 |
| **10. Reflects advisory group input in planning needs assessment . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 14<br>15 | 17<br>23 | 18<br>11 |
| **11. Discusses procedures for setting priorities . . . . | 14<br>17 | 14<br>16 | 21<br>16 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scale: | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| Element B: | strong | | adequate | | weak | |
| D = | 1 | 11 | 12 | 14 | 11 | $\bar{X} = 2.53$ |
| F = | 5 | 13 | 21 | 8 | 2 | $\bar{X} = 3.22$ |

---

[1] Criteria preceded by (**) are implicit in material and documentation provided the states by the Office of Career Education and the Council of Chief State School Officers.

*Top Number = Number of draft state plans receiving that rating.
Bottom Number = Number of final state plans receiving that rating.

***If a state had not conducted a prior needs assessment, it was rated "Not applicable" on this criterion.

N = 49

Element C. Table 4 summarizes the ratings of draft and final state plans across all states on criteria for element C, the State's efforts and accomplishments to date. Results indicate that the description of past career education activities and accomplishments related to the needs identified in element B earned ratings of "Strong" or "Adequate" for 43 draft state plans. Ratings on criterion 2 indicate, however, that almost one-half of the states (23) provided no evidence of assessment of existing plans, materials, programs and practices related to career education. Comparison of results for final versions of state plans with draft versions indicates some improvement on criterion 2. Seven states improved their ratings on this criterion. During analysis of state plans, it was generally found that states mentioned existing programs and practices, but did not report any attempts to assess the effectiveness of such programs and practices.

Element D. The ratings for state plans on element D, the Objectives for the one- and five-year plan, for all states are summarized in Table 5. It can be seen that state plans received generally good ratings. Of interest in this element is the inclusion of five criteria (4 through 8) taken from material and documentation provided the states by the Office of Career Education and the Council of Chief State School Officers. Note that ratings on such criteria were high. This contrasts with the "Weak" ratings on criteria in element B that were also taken from material provided by OCE. In discussion with coordinators, inclusion of criteria from OCE material for this element was not criticized, possibly because such criteria represent attributes of well-stated objectives with which SEAs are more familiar.

Criteria 2, 3 and 6 represent the only breaks in the generally strong ratings on the criteria for this element. Assessing plans against criterion 3 it was found that some states provided objectives that did not clearly require five years to implement or were so vague as to make reasonable progression toward defining a fully integrated program questionable. Some states were rated weak on criterion 6 because they failed to include objectives for all levels K-12. Discussions with coordinators, as well as statements in the plans, indicated that levels were not addressed because the SEA did not want to dictate the objectives LEAs were to implement.

Comparing ratings on final plans with ratings on draft plans indicates that states made slight improvement on already high ratings.

Many plans were commended for using a chart format to present objectives, activities, timelines and staff and other resource requirements for each year of the five-year plan. Such a format presented a clear picture of the objectives for each year and increased ease of understanding by reviewers. It is recommended that other states consider such a format as it is expected that LEAs will also find it easier to understand plans so displayed.

## Table 4

### Summary Across States for Element C

| Element/Criteria | Scale* | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | strong | adequate | weak |
| C. Describes the State's career education efforts and accomplishments to date to meet those needs identified in Element B, including an assessment of existing programs, practices, and materials. | | | |
| 1. Describes past State CE activities and accomplishments related to the needs identified in Element B. | 11<br>13 | 32<br>31 | 6<br>5 |
| 2. Includes assessment of existing plans, programs, practices, materials, and staff development efforts which relate to career education (e.g., counseling and guidance, vocational guidance, Title I, special education, CETA plans and activities, etc.) . . . | 11<br>14 | 15<br>19 | 23<br>16 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scale: | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| Element C: | strong | | adequate | | weak | |
| D = | 6 | 7 | 12 | 19 | 5 | $\overline{X} = 2.80$ |
| F = | 6 | 10 | 21 | 9 | 3 | $\overline{X} = 3.14$ |

*Top Number = Number of draft state plans receiving that rating.
Bottom Number = Number of final state plans receiving that rating.

N = 49

## Table 5

## Summary Across States for Element D

| Element/Criteria | Scale* strong | adequate | weak |
|---|---|---|---|
| D. Specifies the objectives the State will seek to achieve in implementing career education within the state for 1977-78, and for 1977-78 through 1981-82. | | | |
| 1. Specifies objectives for 1977-78 . . . . . . . . | 27<br>28 | 17<br>18 | 5<br>3 |
| 2. Specifies objectives for the five-year Plan, 1977-78 through 1981-82. . . . . . . . . . . . . | 18<br>21 | 15<br>19 | 16<br>9 |
| 3. Presents objectives which represent a reasonable incremental progression toward defining a fully integrated program . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 16<br>17 | 17<br>21 | 16<br>11 |
| **4.[1] Presents objectives which are consistent with the state's conceptual base. . . . . . . . . . . | 18<br>19 | 28<br>28 | 3<br>2 |
| **5. Presents objectives which are related to identified needs . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 19<br>21 | 26<br>25 | 4<br>3 |
| **6. States objectives for all levels K-12. . . . . . | 19<br>22 | 20<br>21 | 10<br>6 |
| **7. Defines objectives in measurable terms . . . . . | 23<br>23 | 23<br>23 | 3<br>3 |
| **8. Presents only objectives which are attainable. . | 29<br>31 | 19<br>17 | 1<br>1 |

| Scale: | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Element D: | strong | | adequate | | weak | |
| D = | 8 | 15 | 14 | 10 | 2 | $\bar{X} = 3.35$ |
| F = | 10 | 17 | 17 | 4 | 1 | $\bar{X} = 3.63$ |

---

[1] Criteria preceded by (**) are implicit in material and documentation provided the states by the Office of Career Education and The Council of Chief State School Officers.

*Top Number = Number of draft state plans receiving that rating.
Bottom Number = Number of final state plans receiving that rating.

N = 49

Element E. This element addresses the Strategies the state will use to encourage LEA implementation. The ratings for state plans on element E for all states are presented in Table 6. It can be seen from Table 6 that almost all states were rated adequate or strong in terms of training and retraining, both pre- and inservice, for personnel to enable them to implement career education (criterion 6).

A large number of draft plans were rated "Weak" on criteria 1b and 7. Twenty-three states did not address the effect/benefit of career education on vocational education. Seventeen states were judged weak with respect to presenting a comprehensive implementation approach (criterion 7). Implementation was typically judged weak because the strategies, activities and resources did not satisfy one or more of the following subcriteria:

a. proceeds in small steps from little or no career education to a fully integrated program

b. includes tasks and timelines which assure that the plan will be implemented effectively

c. reflects the concepts represented by subsections 1 through 6 of this element

d. specifies roles of SEA, IEAs and LEAs in the implementation process

e. represents an outreach that will include all IEAs and LEAs in dissemination/training/planning/implementing and evaluating cycles.

Results on final plans showed improvement, especially on criterion 1b.

As with element D, states that used a chart to array the strategies, activities and resources for implementing the one- and five-year plans and to relate these to the objectives for each year were commended for the easy-to-understand format.

Element F. Two evaluation approaches are addressed in this element (Evaluation): the state's plan to evaluate its own efforts, and guidelines the state plan provides for LEA evaluation of their career education efforts. Training and technical assistance the SEA will provide LEAs to ensure the credibility of such evaluations are also addressed.

Table 7 summarizes the ratings for all states on the criteria for element F. It can be seen from Table 7 that draft plans were generally rated "Weak" on criteria dealing with the identification of inputs at the SEA level (criterion 1), guidelines for LEAs to identify inputs at the local level (criterion 2) and procedures for monitoring administration and implementation at the SEA level (criterion 3). Analysis of the state

## Table 6

### Summary Across States for Element E

| Element/Criteria | Scale* | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | strong | adequate | weak |
| E. Sets forth the strategies, activities, and resources to be utilized in implementing the one- and five-year plans in the following areas: | | | |
| **1.[1] Presents curriculum which reflects the effect/benefit of CE on: | | | |
| a. experiential learning outside of the school building . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 15/16 | 19/24 | 15/9 |
| b. vocational education . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 9/11 | 17/25 | 23/13 |
| **2. Includes plans for career counseling, guidance, placement, and follow-up . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 19/19 | 20/27 | 10/3 |
| **3. Provides for meeting the CE needs of special groups, including the handicapped and other educationally disadvantaged students, and for eliminating the stereotyping of career opportunities by race or by sex . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 20/21 | 20/22 | 9/6 |
| **4. Provides for involvement of the business/labor/industry/professional/government community in CE . . | 18/21 | 25/25 | 6/3 |
| **5. Provides for involving the home and family structure in CE . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 16/17 | 19/22 | 14/10 |
| **6. Provides for training and retraining, both pre- and in-service, for personnel to enable them to implement CE . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 33/33 | 14/16 | 2/0 |
| 7. Presents strategies, activities, and resources which reflect a comprehensive implementation approach . . | 11/11 | 21/24 | 17/14 |
| 8. Includes provision for identifying existing and potential resources from across the United States that could be used to develop and implement career education within the State, including at least the following types of resources: career education instructional materials; educational facilities; educational personnel; career education programs and practices with potential for use within the State, including programs and practices designed to eliminate sex-role stereotyping in career choices; business, labor, industry, professional, government, and other community resources. | 23/24 | 20/19 | 6/6 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scale: | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| Element E: | strong | | adequate | | weak | |
| | D = 7 | 8 | 17 | 15 | 2 | $\bar{X} = 3.06$ |
| | F = 7 | 13 | 19 | 9 | 1 | $\bar{X} = 3.33$ |
| | $\bar{X} = 3.14$ | | | | | |

---

[1] Criteria preceded by (**) are part of Element E as it appears in the rules and regulations for P.L. 93-380.

*Top Number = Number of draft state plans receiving that rating.
Bottom Number = Number of final state plans receiving that rating.

N = 49

## Table 7

## Summary Across States for Element F

| Element/Criteria | Scale* | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | strong | adequate | weak |
| F. Specifies plans for evaluating the effectiveness of career education inputs, processes and outcomes in local education agencies and in personnel training programs. | | | |
| 1. Includes procedures for identifying and recording inputs (e.g., federal funds, State funds, personnel, etc.) at the SEA level . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 12<br>16 | 13<br>19 | 24<br>14 |
| 2. Provides guidance for identifying and recording inputs at the LEA level . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 5<br>9 | 15<br>18 | 29<br>22 |
| 3. Includes procedures for monitoring and recording administration and implementation processes at the SEA level . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 10<br>12 | 10<br>26 | 29<br>11 |
| 4. Provides guidance for monitoring and recording LEA administration and implementation processes . . . . | 13<br>14 | 24<br>26 | 12<br>9 |
| 5. Includes procedures for evaluating the extent to which the major desired outcomes of the State Plan are accomplished . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 16<br>18 | 21<br>23 | 12<br>8 |
| 6. Includes plans for monitoring the extent to which LEAs' major desired outcomes are accomplished . . . | 10<br>10 | 28<br>31 | 11<br>8 |
| 7. Includes procedures for evaluating inputs, processes and outcomes of personnel training programs at the State Level . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 10<br>11 | 25<br>31 | 14<br>7 |

| Scale: | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Element F: | strong | | adequate | | weak | |
| D = | 2 | 10 | 17 | 15 | 5 | $\overline{X} = 2.78$ |
| F = | 4 | 12 | 25 | 8 | 0 | $\overline{X} = 3.24$ |

*Top Number = Number of draft state plans receiving that rating.
Bottom Number = Number of final state plans receiving that rating.

N = 49

plans revealed that states rated "Weak" on the first two criteria did not address inputs. In such cases, it was recommended that states include procedures for identifying and recording sources and uses of a broad array of career education inputs (funds, personnel, etc.). Most states rated "Weak" on administration had failed to address administration or management procedures. Mean ratings on final plans indicate improvement on all three criteria, especially criteria one and three. On criterion one, 24 states were judged "Weak" on draft plans but only 14 were judged "Weak" on final plans. On criterion three, 29 states were judged "Weak" on draft versions, but only 11 were judged "Weak" on final plans.

Element G. Table 8 presents a summary of the ratings for all state plans on element G, Dissemination strategies. The data indicate that 26 draft plans were generally "Weak" with respect to including schedules of state dissemination activities (criterion 4). Many states left LEA dissemination activities to LEAs to develop. Thus, states were rated "Weak" on criterion 4. In final versions of state plans, only 18 plans were judged "Weak" on this criterion.

Element H. Table 9 presents ratings of all state plans for element H, Funding needed to implement the plan. It can be seen from Table 9 that 30 state draft plans were generally rated less than adequate on this element. In analyzing the plans, it was found that: 32 states typically addressed this element by presenting only annual total fund requirements rather than specifying funds needed for each program component (criterion 1); 23 states limited their sources of funds to the Career Education Incentive Act or did not specify sources of funds (criterion 2); and 30 state plans did not present realistic costs for implemenation (criterion 3). A "Weak" rating for cost realism (criterion 3) could be expected, however, for states that did not specify funding for each program component.

Ratings on final versions of state plans for this element show marked improvement. Ten states showed improvement on criterion 1, nine on criterion 2 and 15 on criterion 3.

Element I. Ratings of all state plans for element I, Relationship of state plan to other career education activities being carried out in post-secondary education, are summarized in Table 10. It can be seen from Table 10 that states adequately showed the relationship of the state plan to career education activities in post-secondary and adult education settings.

Thirty-two states included specific strategies for achieving LEA coordination with other community education agencies, organizations and institutions in their draft plans. In many cases, agencies were named and included colleges/universities, teacher/counselor/administrator training institutions, adult and continuing education institutions, and community colleges.

## Table 8

## Summary Across States for Element G

| Element/Criteria | Scale* | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | strong | adequate | weak |
| G. Specifies plans for disseminating information about career education, career education practices and products, and the results of career education efforts to interested persons within the State. | | | |
| 1. Includes plans for State dissemination to a range of populations concerned with career education (e.g., post-secondary, business, labor, industry, community, etc.) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 19<br>21 | 23<br>24 | 7<br>4 |
| 2. Includes schedules of State dissemination activities . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 9<br>10 | 21<br>26 | 19<br>13 |
| 3. Includes State dissemination strategies . . . . . . | 14<br>14 | 25<br>27 | 10<br>8 |
| 4. Provides guidance for LEA dissemination activities . | 9<br>11 | 14<br>20 | 26<br>18 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scale: | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| Element G: | strong | | adequate | | weak | |
| D = | 4 | 10 | 15 | 11 | 9 | $\overline{X}$ = 2.78 |
| F = | 4 | 16 | 19 | 8 | 2 | $\overline{X}$ = 3.24 |

*Top Number = Number of draft state plans receiving that rating.
Bottom Number = Number of final state plans receiving that rating.

N = 49

## Table 9

## Summary Across States for Element H

| Element/Criteria | Scale* | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | strong | adequate | weak |
| H. Specifies the funding that will be needed to implement the various components of the one year and five year plans and the sources of the necessary funding, where these sources are available. | | | |
| 1. Specifies funding needed to implement each program component (e.g., administration, staff development, etc.) for each year of the one year and five year plans . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | $\frac{12}{19}$ | $\frac{5}{8}$ | $\frac{32}{22}$ |
| 2. Specifies current and projected federal and state sources of funds which will support implementation of components of the Plan . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | $\frac{10}{12}$ | $\frac{16}{23}$ | $\frac{23}{14}$ |
| 3. Presents realistic costs for implementation . . . . | $\frac{14}{17}$ | $\frac{8}{21}$ | $\frac{30}{15}$ |

| Scale: | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Element H: | strong | | adequate | | weak | |
| D = | 7 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 25 | $\overline{X}$ = 2.24 |
| F = | 10 | 6 | 15 | 7 | 11 | $\overline{X}$ = 2.94 |

*Top Number = Number of draft state plans receiving that rating.
Bottom Number = Number of final state plans receiving that rating.

N = 49

Thirty-six states indicated relationships with other agencies by memberships on SEA advisory councils and boards. These states listed council members and identified them by role/institution.

The number of states (21) receiving a strong rating for criterion 3 indicates the importance states place on coordination with teacher/counselor training institutions. These states also included procedures for achieving such coordination. Results of ratings on final plans show slight improvement on an already strong element.

Element J. (Implementation) While element E addresses implementation of the substantive state plan, element J focuses on the implementation of the administration plan. Table 11 presents a summary of the ratings for all states on element J, and reveals that 23 states were rated less than adequate on this element. Criteria with which states had particular difficulty in draft plans include management of activities (criterion 2), monitoring (criterion 6), specification of the types of data needed to assess effectiveness of administrative procedures (criterion 7), and specification of procedures for review of the implementation plan (criterion 8).

Criterion 2 requires states to present a management plan which includes major administrative tasks with clearly defined lines of authority and responsibility related to these tasks. Analysis of state plans indicated that 21 states did not present such a plan or the plan did not indicate how tasks would be managed.

Criterion 6 requires the state to present procedures and timelines for monitoring administration of the state plan. Assessment of the plans revealed that only 4 states presented such procedures and timelines. Twenty-four states did not address monitoring functions and thus were rated "Weak."

Criterion 7 required states to specify types of data to be collected (e.g., numbers of LEAs submitting draft plans; number of requests for technical assistance, etc.), to assess effectiveness of each administrative task. State plans could be rated "Strong" or "Adequate" only if the plan contained management tasks (criterion 2). Table 11 indicates that 25 draft plans were rated "Weak" either because they did not specify such data or they did not contain management tasks as required by criterion 2. Draft plans rated adequate (20) specified types of data for some but not all major administrative tasks.

Criterion 8 addresses procedures for reviewing the implementation plan. Many draft plans (27) adequately provided procedures for reviews. However, 22 states did not address review of the implementation plan.

## Table 10

## Summary Across States for Element I

| Element/Criteria | Scale* strong | Scale* adequate | Scale* weak |
|---|---|---|---|
| I. Shows relationship of the State Plan for Career Education to career education activities being carried out and contemplated in post-secondary and adult education settings. | | | |
| 1. Presents guidelines for LEA coordination with other community education agencies, organizations, and institutions . . . . . . . . . . . . . | $\frac{9}{11}$ | $\frac{23}{26}$ | $\frac{17}{12}$ |
| 2. Evidences relationships with other agencies in part by memberships on SEA Advisory Councils, Boards, etc.. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | $\frac{10}{13}$ | $\frac{26}{27}$ | $\frac{13}{9}$ |
| 3. Addresses SEA coordination with teacher/counselor training institutions . . . . . . . . . | $\frac{21}{25}$ | $\frac{19}{17}$ | $\frac{9}{7}$ |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scale: | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| Element I: | strong | | adequate | | weak | |
| | D = 3 | 12 | 16 | 14 | 4 | $\overline{X} = 2.92$ |
| | F = 4 | 17 | 21 | 5 | 2 | $\overline{X} = 3.33$ |

*Top Number = Number of draft state plans receiving that rating.
Bottom Number = Number of final state plans receiving that rating.

N = 49

## Table 11

### Summary Across States for Element J

| Element/Criteria | Scale* | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | strong | adequate | weak |
| J. Specifies the manner in which the plan is to be implemented and administered by the SEA, which: | | | |
| **1.[1] includes allocation of resources . . . . . . . . . . | $\frac{7}{10}$ | $\frac{26}{28}$ | $\frac{16}{11}$ |
| **2. includes management of activities . . . . . . . . . | $\frac{11}{11}$ | $\frac{17}{23}$ | $\frac{21}{15}$ |
| **3. includes provision of assistance to others within the State . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | $\frac{24}{26}$ | $\frac{23}{20}$ | $\frac{3}{3}$ |
| **4. includes staffing for career education within the SEA . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | $\frac{23}{24}$ | $\frac{18}{17}$ | $\frac{8}{8}$ |
| **5. includes relationship of CE Plan to other planning efforts at the State level (e.g., Vocational Education State Plan, Title III State Plan, etc.) . | $\frac{14}{16}$ | $\frac{25}{24}$ | $\frac{10}{9}$ |
| 6. specifies monitoring checkpoints in the management plan . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | $\frac{4}{4}$ | $\frac{21}{26}$ | $\frac{24}{19}$ |
| 7. specifies the type(s) of data that will be collected to assess effectiveness of administrative procedures. | $\frac{6}{7}$ | $\frac{18}{22}$ | $\frac{25}{20}$ |
| 8. specifies procedures for review of implementation plan . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | $\frac{7}{9}$ | $\frac{20}{24}$ | $\frac{22}{16}$ |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scale: | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| Element J: | strong | | adequate | | weak | |
| | D = 2 | 10 | 14 | 18 | 5 | $\overline{X}$ = 2.65 |
| | F = 2 | 13 | 21 | 11 | 2 | $\overline{X}$ = 3.04 |

---

[1] Criteria preceded by (**) are part of Element J as it appears in the rules and regulations for P.L. 93-380.

*Top Number = Number of draft state plans receiving that rating.
Bottom Number = Number of final state plans receiving that rating.

N = 49

## Overall Rating by State

The rating each state received on each element was averaged to determine an overall rating for that state plan on the five-point scale. Table 12 presents the overall rating received by each state on the draft and final assessment report. The number in the state code column refers to the code assigned to a state plan based on the order in which the plan was received from the Office of Career Education. The numbers do not represent an alphabetical listing by state. Ratings are presented in rank order beginning with the state plan that received the highest mean rating on the draft plan. Ratings are also presented for the final plan of each state.

According to Table 12, 23 (46%) of the 49 state plans received a total rating of 3.0 or higher on the draft assessment report. Thirty (61%) rated 3.0 or higher on the final report. Thus, it can be said that they adequately reflect the elements and criteria of P.L. 93-380. Eighteen draft state plans (36%) were rated 2.5 or lower and needed to make substantial refinements or modifications in their plans in order to satisfy the requirements of P.L. 93-380. Table 12 also reveals that ratings of draft state plans ranged from a high of 4.1 to a low of 1.4.

Of 28 states that submitted revisions or addenda, all but three reflect an improved overall rating. One state, #17, went from a mean rating of 1.9 (Weak to Adequate) to 4.0 (Adequate to Strong).

## Table 12
## Mean Rating of Draft and Final Plans by State

| State* Code | Draft Rating | Final Rating | State Code | Draft Rating | Final Rating | State Code | Draft Rating | Final Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | 4.1** | 4.1 | 38 | 3.2 | 4.0 | 20 | 2.1 | 2.1 |
| 36 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 16 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 24 | 2.1 | 2.4 |
| 32 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 22 | 3.0 | 3.9 | 10 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| 39 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 6 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 17 | 1.9 | 4.0 |
| 2 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 8 | 2.9 | 3.4 | 3 | 1.8 | 2.9 |
| 21 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 44 | 2.9 | 3.6 | 7 | 1.8 | 2.9 |
| 33 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 25 | 2.8 | 3.3 | 30 | 1.8 | 1.9 |
| 37 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 40 | 2.8 | 4.4 | 46 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| 48 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 34 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 19 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| 4 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 43 | 2.7 | 2.7 | | | |
| 29 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 11 | 2.6 | 2.6 | | | |
| 31 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 5 | 2.5 | 2.9 | | | |
| 41 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 12 | 2.5 | 2.5 | | | |
| 1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 23 | 2.5 | 2.7 | | | |
| 18 | 3.3 | 3.7 | 28 | 2.5 | 2.6 | | | |
| 27 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 42 | 2.5 | 3.0 | | | |
| 45 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 14 | 2.4 | 2.4 | | | |
| 13 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 49 | 2.4 | 3.0 | | | |
| 26 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 9 | 2.3 | 2.3 | | | |
| 35 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 47 | 2.2 | 2.2 | | | |

* The state code number refers to the order in which the state plan was received by project staff.

**5=Strong; 1=Weak

N = 49

## Chapter III

## PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS ENCOUNTERED IN DEVELOPING STATE PLANS

This Chapter summarizes the efforts by project staff to identify problems encountered and solutions attempted by states in the development of their state plans. Staff employed a number of strategies in identifying such problems and solutions: site visitations, analysis of final reports submitted to OCE as part of P.L. 93-380 grant requirements, and discussions with coordinators during the course of the project.

Problems encountered were those that presented barriers to plan development. Sometimes these might not be recognized as problems and therefore might not be reported by states. The project staff was alert to hidden as well as declared problems. Remedial measures were those procedures and materials introduced by an SEA during the formulation, development, dissemination, or implementation of a state plan to overcome barriers.

Results of the three avenues of inquiry overlap considerably--that is, the same problems and concerns surfaced repeatedly. Since there is so much duplication, results are combined and are presented according to those elements from P.L. 93-380 for which one or more problems were identified.

This Chapter relates the problems and solutions identified by staff to overall results of assessment of the draft state plans described in Chapter II. Relating problems to identified weaknesses in state plans may help explain reasons for such weaknesses. Solutions states attempted may serve as guidelines for other states as they refine and implement their plans.

Definition and Conceptual Base. This element requires the state to present its definition of career education and the conceptual base upon which career education in the state rests. The major problem reported by states relative to this element dealt with the difficulty of developing a statement with appropriate emphasis on the special needs of minorities, handicapped, and other educationally disadvantaged students. This problem is reflected in assessment of state plans. On the assessments of draft state plans, twenty of 49 states were rated weak for failure to include the goal of preparing handicapped and other educationally disadvantaged students for full participation in society. Most states declared that career education is for all children, but failed to state how special populations would be served. In discussions with coordinators, staff were told that reference to "all children" included handicapped and therefore the criterion was met. Although 20 state plans were rated weak on this criterion, only seven states chose to include such a statement in their revised plans.

The Need for Career Education in the State. Of the problems reported by states in developing their state plans, more are related to needs assessment than to any other element. Problems related to needs assessment can be categorized into three areas: (1) problems related to conducting a comprehensive needs assessment; (2) difficulties associated with using an advisory committee to assist with the needs assessment; (3) problems with the role and responsibility of a state task force.

1. A number of states indicated they had difficulty conducting a comprehensive needs assessment because of:

- lack of time, staff and money
- lack of freedom to conduct an appropriate needs assessment because of Board policy or procedural limitation
- difficulties in identifying/developing instruments
- complaints by LEAs of too many assessments from SEA
- difficulty of assessing non-school populations

Some states indicated that planning and implementing a creditable needs assessment, particularly in a large state, requires two or more years. Getting Board approval, developing and field testing instruments, securing cooperation of LEAs and other participants, collecting data, tabulating results, etc., requires more time, money and staff than the P.L. 93-380 grants provided for. States suggested a number of ways to solve this problem. To help keep costs down, one state contracted the scoring of the instrument to students in a data processing class in a local high school. A number of states extracted data from existing needs assessment information. Other states solved the problem of lack of staff by having the advisory committee become more involved in the planning process. One state drew from their advisory council members who represented populations needed for assessment input.

Some states have Board policies prohibiting any assessments other than the approved state testing program. One state that indicated difficulties because of Board policy suggested that the solution to gaining more freedom to operate a full needs assessment was to market career education to gain public support. A state that could not conduct a needs assessment from the state level because of procedural limitations awarded grants to local schools to conduct the assessment. There was no indication as to the level of technical assistance the SEA provided or results of this strategy.

A number of states encountered problems in identifying/developing needs assessment instruments. Such problems included instruments that were inappropriate for the population sampled and lack of familiarity with instrument development. One state that expressed this difficulty relied on consultants to develop the instruments. Other states developed and refined their instruments using feedback from pilot-testing procedures.

A number of coordinators mentioned that LEAs complained about the excessive amount of needs data required of them. Solutions to this problem varied. One state indicated that it incorporated questions for career education into existing statewide assessment instruments. Another state extracted most of the needed data from results of needs assessments completed recently by other state educational units. Still another state asked the superintendent to write a letter to each LEA requesting that they participate in the needs assessment efforts. Difficulty in assessment of non-school populations (e.g., business, labor, industry, parents) was noted by several states. One state attempted to solve the problem by dividing the advisory council into groups according to education and non-education representation. Needs information was secured from these advisory council groups.

2. The most common problems related to the efficient use of advisory councils were:

- working productively with large advisory councils
- obtaining concensus with diverse interest groups represented
- insufficient decision-making power

A number of states noted difficulty with making the advisory council productive due to attendance problems at meetings, lack of clear operating guidelines, or insufficient time away from work to handle council business. Strategies that were used to solve this problem included: paying expenses to attend meetings; dividing the large advisory council into small task forces and letting the task forces develop needs instruments; meeting from late afternoon into the evening and again the next morning; providing clear guidelines as to role, function and contributions expected from the advisory council.

The problem of obtaining consensus with diverse interest groups was solved by one state by dividing the council into groups during the meeting (e.g., K-12; post-secondary; business/labor/industry; parents; etc.). Another state found that clearly defining the purpose of the council during its first meeting helped attain consensus. One state found the use of a group facilitator helpful in achieving consensus.

One coordinator indicated that the advisory council was uncommitted because guidelines said they were to recommend--not to decide. The coordinator solved this problem by contacting members individually prior to the council meetings to assure them that their participation and recommendations were important parts of the decision making process. Most saw an effective advisory council as one that was available to review and react to procedures and documents, to make recommendations, and, in some cases, to assist the staff with such needs assessment tasks as development of instruments and tabulation of responses.

3. There were a number of problems associated with misunderstandings about the role and responsibility of the state task force in the planning process. In the opinion of one task force, an apparently serious problem involved the lack of promptness of state career education staff in completing sections of the state plan. The total needs assessment calendar was thrown off schedule. A solution was found by developing a calendar of events and responsibilities.

One state expected their task force to help write the plan. The task force felt that its role was advisory in nature. The issue was resolved when the SEA staff agreed to write the plan using the task force as an advisory group.

The difficulties mentioned by states and coordinators in conducting needs assessments is reflected in the overall poor rating of draft state plans on this element. Twenty-five states were judged less than adequate in their needs assessment strategies reported in draft plans. Over half the plans did not adequately assess the needs of all students in the elementary, middle/junior high, and senior high schools of the state and/or did not include parents, educators, business, industry, labor, or government agencies as populations responding to the needs assessments. Eighteen states did not use available data (e.g., public opinion polls, demographic data, etc.), to gather or supplement their needs data.

States' Career Education Efforts to Date. This element requires the state to describe its career education efforts and accomplishments to date to meet the needs identified during the conduct of their needs assessment, including an assessment of existing programs, practices and materials. Although no problems that could be categorized under this element were reported by states, it is interesting to note that 23 states were judged weak on this element because they did not address assessing their existing programs, practices and materials. It is difficult to know whether they did not recognize this as a problem, or they did not report it as a problem because they has not assessed their programs.

Implementing the One- and Five-Year Plan. This element requires the state to set forth the strategies, activities, and resources to be utilized in implementing the one- and five-year plans. Problems typically encountered by states involved lack of availability of anticipated implementation resources, whether at the LEA level (number of LEAs identified as having extensive implementation resources was smaller than anticipated), the state level (no state-wide resource center), or the national level (national resources didn't address implementation). The solutions states attempted primarily involved review of resources of other states to determine appropriateness to state needs, and determination of availability of these resources.

In assessment of draft plans almost one-third of the states were rated weak in the strategies, activities and resources they plan to use to implement the state plan.

Plans for Evaluating the Effectiveness of Career Education Inputs, Processes and Outcomes in Local Education Agencies. Two evaluation approaches are addressed in this element: (1) the state's plan to evaluate its own efforts; and (2) guidelines the state plan provides for LEA evaluation of their career education efforts. In discussions with coordinators, two problems were noted. The first dealt with procedures for identifying and recording inputs at the SEA level. The second dealt with providing guidance for identifying and recording inputs at the LEA level. Most coordinators appeared to be unfamiliar with input evaluation, and unclear about appropriate procedures. Assessment of draft state plans on this element reveals that more states were rated weak on these two criteria than on the others. Guidelines for LEAs were judged weak in 29 plans. Procedures for identifying inputs at the SEA level were judged weak in 24 plans.

Dissemination Plans. States were required to specify plans for disseminating information about career education, career education practices and products, and the results of career education efforts to interested persons within the state. Problems reported by states were attributed to lack of sufficient time to implement existing dissemination plans or reliance on the development of other documents to support dissemination. For example, one state noted that dissemination plans included utilizing a newsletter. Publication of the newsletter was delayed to the point where it disrupted the dissemination timelines. States attempted to overcome these problems through other strategies such as the use of alternative publications and journals and conferences.

The problem of lack of time seemed to affect the quality of the state plan with regard to providing a schedule of dissemination activities. During analysis of draft state plans it was found that states specified adequate dissemination activities but 19 states did not include a schedule of such activities.

Funding Required to Implement the Plan. This element requires the state to specify the funding that will be needed to implement the various components of the one- and five-year plans, and the sources of the funding where these sources are available. The problems reported by states were attributed to uncertainty over the availability of the federal funds needed to develop the plan or to employ a state coordinator. Solutions reported by states included having another SEA department pick up the coordinator's salary or transferring money from one budget to another.

Assessment of draft state plans revealed that more states rated low on this element than on any other. Most states treated budgeting very broadly. One explanation provided for such broad treatment was that the superintendent discouraged listing of budgetary sources until funds were available.

Manner in Which Plan is to be Implemented and Administered. This element requires the state to specify the manner in which the plan is to be implemented and administered by the SEA. The most common problems related to tight time constraints for getting bidders to help on the plan, insufficient full-time staff to work on the plan, and securing and coordinating state plan input from others (e.g., task forces, staff within the SEA, needs data, etc.) on a timely basis. States reported that a solution to these problems was to request an extension of time to complete plan development.

Other. There was one problem noted during site visits, analysis of final project reports and conversations with coordinators that relates to general plan development rather than to any one element. The problem was lack of federal guidelines for plan development. A number of coordinators noted that lack of guidelines, a tight time schedule for all the tasks required as a basis for developing a viable state plan, and small funding made the development of the plan very difficult.

Among the strategies used to solve this problem were: (1) coordinators sought assistance from career education coordinators from other states who were further along in the development of their state plans; (2) where state plan development was initiated prior to P.L. 93-380, attempts to reconcile differences in format and approach were minimized.

## Summary

Looking at the range of problems reported by states, a pattern emerges related to four broad areas of problems: (1) problems in securing commitment and full involvement of the advisory council and/or task force, and in definition of the role and function of these groups; (2) problems of time constraints as limited career education staffs attempted to complete the tasks basic to plan development; (3) staffing problems including divided leadership (person responsible for career education was responsible for other programs as well), insufficient staff (in some states career education is a one person--or even half a person--unit), and lack of experience and expertise in plan development; (4) problems with accessing the time, money, approval, expertise, and staff necessary to conduct a creditable needs assessment.

1. Clear role definition would help ensure productive involvement of advisory groups and task forces to provide guidance, support and assistance in the development of the plan.

2. Many problems related to time constraints were noted under more than one element. Such time constraints posed difficulties in conducting needs assessments, developing objectives, conducting dissemination activities and managing the general planning effort. Apparently, the time available to develop the state plan was too constraining given normal difficulties in missed deadlines, gaining support for the planning effort, state procedure, constraints, etc. The typical solution for this problem was to adjust timelines.

3. States also reported problems with staffing. For example, because of decreased support, critical staff members (e.g., director, coordinator) left or were transferred to other projects or units during development of the plan. Some staff members were assigned to the planning effort on a part time basis. In other cases there were not enough staff. Few states were able to resolve these problems. Loss of staff presented a special hardship.

4. The results of the analysis described in this Chapter, coupled with assessment of the draft state plans, provided supporting evidence of a serious problem area--needs assessment. State ratings averaged less than adequate on needs assessment. Such a rating is explained in part by looking at the most frequently encountered problems as reported by the states. Since the identification of needs is so critical to planning at any level, consideration should be given to improving the skills of SEA personnel in this area. Although ratings on needs assessment improved somewhat on the final state plans, they still were not strong.

In talking with state coordinators, advisory council members, and others at the various sites it became evident that the task of developing a state plan was perceived as an onerous one and that commitment on the part of at least one person (usually the state coordinator of career education) was imperative if the plan was to be completed with reasonable attention to the requirements of P.L. 93-380.

The site visit team was impressed by the commitment of the people they interviewed and by the amount of time and effort that had been expended on plan development. Team members were also impressed by the numbers of problems encountered by these persons and the need for state and federal technical assistance and support during their efforts. The site visits provided considerable information on planning processes, not only in terms of problems encountered but of creative and effective ways to approach the planning process.

## Chapter IV

## ANALYSIS OF STATUS OF CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION AND PLANNED IMPLEMENTATION OF STATE PLANS FOR CAREER EDUCATION

As the staff contacted state coordinators of career education in pursuit of the various project tasks, it became evident that the prospects for implementation of the state plans for career education varied considerably from state to state. Since problems encountered had an impact on implementation, the analysis of problems and solutions as discussed in Chapter III was examined to suggest questions for telephone interviews with each of the state coordinators. The purpose of these interviews was to determine the status of implementation of the state plans, as well as plans for implementation after receipt of funds under P.L. 95-207.

### Telephone Interviews

To explore the extent to which each state had begun to implement its state plan, project staff decided that each staff member would telephone the coordinator of career education in each of the states for which that staff member was primary reviewer. Since staff members had already established communications with the coordinators of these states and also knew their state plans very well, it appeared that this was the most efficient way to accomplish the task of interviewing coordinators about the status of their plan implementation. The 44 states submitting state plans, and the District of Columbia, were included in this telephone survey. Territories were not included.

Table 13

States With Which Telephone Interviews were Held

Alaska
Alabama
Arizona
Arkansas
California
Colorado
Connecticut
Delaware
District of Columbia
Florida
Georgia
Hawaii
Idaho
Illinois
Indiana
Iowa
Kansas
Kentucky
Maine
Maryland
Massachusetts
Michigan
Minnesota
Mississippi
Montana
Nebraska
Nevada
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New Mexico
New York
North Carolina
North Dakota
Ohio
Oklahoma
Oregon
Pennsylvania
South Carolina
South Dakota
Tennessee
Texas
Vermont
West Virginia
Wisconsin
Wyoming

N=45

## Procedures

A format for recording responses during interviews was developed to enhance accuracy, comparability, and comprehensiveness in the collection of the data. Interviews were begun by explaining that the staff was in the process of determining the status of implementation across the states and that no individual state's implementation status would be reported in any project-related document. Telephone interviews averaged more than one hour each. All of the coordinators were very cooperative in the interview.

In addition to recording administrative data such as name of state and person called, and date and time of call, the format was designed to accommodate responses to two groups of interview questions: (1) Questions regarding status of the plan's objectives to be implemented in year one, and (2) Questions regarding other areas of the plan and status of career education in the state. Contact persons were encouraged to respond in areas beyond implementation related to their specific objectives.

## Group One Inquiry: Status of Plan Objectives

The interview questions for Group One were dependent on the results of a mandatory pre-interview step performed by project staff. The purpose here was to identify objectives in the plan of the target state which were scheduled for implementation in year one. On the basis of this review, project staff chose in some cases to formulate a list of questions for presentation to the contact person during the interview. In most cases, however, project staff discussed the year-one objectives one-by-one with the contact person. Typically during this procedure project staff and the contact person each worked from a copy of the plan and the contact person indicated, at the direction of project staff, the implementation status of each year-one objective. This approach was found to be expedient because it permitted the contact person latitude in describing the status of each objective. For some states, this was not difficult; either the state did not have any objectives to be completed during the first year or they had done nothing on implementation of specific objectives because they had not received any funds from P.L. 95-207. Others, however, went into considerable detail about their activities related to many pages of objectives in their plan. All states had pursued some career education activities although some of these were continuations of regular activities rather than plan implementation.

## Group Two Inquiry: General Status of Career Education in the State

Questions regarding other areas of the plan and status of career education in the state (Group Two) were asked to stimulate discussion. In a majority of the interviews at least the essence of most of the following types of information emerged:

- Whether plan had been adopted by the State Board of Education, or was scheduled to be adopted. Whether the Board sets priorities, and if so, whether the Board made career education a priority.
- Plans for staffing when P.L. 95-207 money is received.
- The State Department of Education's system for receiving proposals for Career Education Incentive Act funds.
- Plans for allocating P.L. 95-207 funds.
- Experiences with legislation that have presented problems or shown legislation to be facilitative.
- Status of development of plan to meet P.L. 95-207 requirements and whether the project-developed criteria and guidelines helped.
- Whether the state has formal technical assistance policy(ies) for helping LEAs.
- The biggest problem anticipated in implementing the state CE plan.
- Whether the State Department has distributed any memoranda or documents encouraging LEAs to develop CE programs, and if not, what plans, if any, it has for doing this.
- Whether the state has any incentives for developing CE programs at the local level.
- Whether any schools have reported using the state plan.

## Results and Discussion

### Group One: Status of Plan Objectives

Even though states used many common sources of information in developing their individual plans (Public Laws 93-380 and 95-207; literature provided state coordinators by the Office of Career Education and by the Council of Chief State School Officers; local and national conferences; use of consultants), objectives were found to vary considerably in number and substance from one state plan to another. As a result, information from the interviews yielded categories of data at best nominal in nature. Table 14 lists 21 categories of information, in descending order of frequency, which emerged from discussion of each state's progress toward attainment of first-year objectives. It must be noted that the categories reflect the substance of objectives (or, in many cases, the listed activities for that objective) as found in the plan and whose status was reported. Although some thought was given to using categories based on the elements/criteria developed for analyzing the state plans for classification of objectives, project staff decided instead to let listed plan objectives dictate the categories. Many overlap and are separated here only as a function of how objectives were stated in the plan.

Twenty-two states reported objectives completed or in progress in the category of inservice training for LEAs. Workshops and conferences were most frequently listed delivery systems. Twenty states reported providing LEAs technical assistance through workshops and conferences and through less formal means such as telephone or personal contact.

Table 14

Categories of State Plan Objectives/Activities
Implemented in Year One (by Number of Responses
Indicating Completion of or Progress on Objective/Activity)

| Category | No. | Category | No. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Inservice training provided LEAs by SEA | 22 | SEA use of other monies | 9 |
| Technical assistance provided LEAs by SEA | 20 | LEA participating in grant/ RFP process | 8 |
| SEA dissemination | 16 | Plan revisions | 8 |
| SEA cooperation with other units/depts. for career education | 14 | Career guidance, counseling, placement activity | 7 |
| Use/development of resource documents/centers | 13 | Post-secondary involvement | 7 |
| LEA involvement in career education | 12 | SEA staff experience with special groups | 6 |
| SEA use of advisory group | 12 | Home and family involvement | 5 |
| SEA involvement of business, labor, industry | 11 | Preservice training in state educational institutions | 5 |
| LEA development of career education programs | 10 | Training of state staff | 4 |
| SEA guidelines for LEAs developed. | 9 | Legislative activity | 3 |
| | | Funding efforts | 2 |

Note. Categories are presented in descending order of frequency.

Conceivably what may have been reported as inservice by one state may have been reported as technical assistance by another, but there was no evidence that states reported the same activity as satisfying more than one category. Combining the categories, forty-two states presented some inservice training and/or technical assistance to LEAs in the area of career education during the year.

Involvement in some kind of dissemination activity was reported by 16 states. Newsletters, news releases, and resource information development were frequently cited dissemination activities. Many states claimed state plan distribution to LEAs as a dissemination activity. This falls short of the implications of P.L. 93-380 dissemination requirements.

Collaborative efforts in use of funds and staff of other educational units/departments within the SEA were reported by 14 states. Resource document/center use or development was reported by 13 states. It must be remembered that this reflects only listed year one objectives. Most states in fact had developed some kind of resource document earlier as required under P.L. 93-380 application data, but many states did not include resource development and or use as a year one objective.

Twelve states reported having objectives completed or in progress relating to LEA involvement in career education and 10 states reported progress on objectives dealing with LEA development of specific local career education programs. In some instances objectives appeared to capitalize on an on-going career education activity at the LEA level; that is, the plan or its objectives didn't necessarily precipitate the reported activity.

Completed or in progress objectives dealing with advisory group use and involvement of business, labor, and industry were reported by 12 and 11 states, respectively. Nine states reported objectives dealing with use of other funds, such as Title IVc, state, and Special Education, for career education purposes. Again one needs to look beyond first-year objectives to fully understand the variables involved in the funding of career education before receipt of CEIA monies. Many states with no listed objectives in this area are nevertheless implementing career education (and vice versa) in the state. While some states are more vigorous than others in this pursuit, it seems that almost always some costs are underwritten by or subsumed under another unit. Too, the enthusiastic career education coordinator who holds another position within the SEA often simply "squeezes" career education in among her/his other duties.

While only 9 states reported year one objectives regarding provision of implementation guidelines to LEAs, it appears that the groundwork for 100% satisfaction of this category is in place.

Categories for which few completed or in-progress year one objectives were reported included home and family involvement (5 states); preservice training in state educational institutions (5); training of state staff (4); and legislative activity (3).

At the risk of being repetitive, caution must be exercised in determining the significance of these categories, or the status of objectives/activities which they represent. A particular state, for example, may not have listed or addressed a given objective; or it may have the objective in place for a subsequent year. Additionally, some state plans did not have objectives, and some contact persons who stated "we have not done anything to implement the plan" did not identify objectives individually. For these and other reasons, it is not known to what extent the reported objectives represent the universe of objectives promised in the state plans for year one completion. Certainly it is not known at this time whether strict and singular interpretation of the status of year one objectives alone is a reliable indicator or predictor of the implementation status of career education in the states.

Not all states were equally able or ambitious in promoting and implementing career education. Objectives completed or in progress were more often than not accomplished through use of existing state resources and systems. Many states have ongoing inservice, technical assistance, and other activities frequently available across units and departments within the agency. Active states seemed to rely on making the most of existing resources. Inactive states often reported economic or political reasons for their inability to move on plan objectives. Since none of the states had received any money from P.L. 95-207 at the time of the telephone interviews, it appeared that the status of implementation was more a function of commitment to career education than to the availability of money. In some cases there appeared to be a high level of commitment of either the legislature or the Board of Education. In other cases, it may have been the commitment of the coordinator, probably with the support of the superintendent. In a few cases where no implementation was taking place, the coordinator expressed great interest in implementing plans as soon as CEIA funds became available.

Some states have state monies committed to career education. Others have had career education programs operating for several years so that activities are in place and fall within the regular budget. Thus project staff gathered compelling evidence of the unevenness of implementation of career education across the states, but some evidence that every state is implementing some career education activities.

## Group Two: General Status of Career Education in the State

All 44 states and the District of Columbia addressed most of the suggested discussion topics listed earlier. Contact persons were given total freedom in responding to project staff's discussion leads.

Legislative problems. Absence of prompting by project staff led to two types of completely different responses concerning problems with legislation. In some cases states interpreted "legislation" to mean problems of support or lack of it by the state legislature. Very few states reported de jure legislative support for career education. In other cases states took legislation to mean interpretation and implementation of federal legislation such as Public Laws 93-380 and 95-207. Repeatedly states expressed a need for early and consistent interpretation of this legislation. Many states said they wished they had received the project guidelines for Public Laws 93-380 and 95-207 at an earlier stage in their plan development. An often expressed problem was the fact that P.L. 95-207 funding became available so late in the year and was so greatly reduced that it presented serious handicaps to implementing their plans.

The requirement of assurance of continuing state support at the same level as the previous year also posed a problem, as some states were therefore being forced to extend incentive programs that had been intended to be short-term. It was suggested that state Boards communicate to their congressmen their concerns about legislative restrictions.

State Boards of Education. State Boards of Education in 22 states were reported to have adopted or to be in process of adopting their plans for career education. Those in process stated that they waited until they revised their plan to satisfy the requirements of P.L. 95-207 before seeking Board adoption. One state reported that state plans are frequently approved by the superintendent without going to the Board of Education at all. Some states indicated the importance of the role of the state superintendent in seeing things through to the Board. Fourteen of the 28 states that reported that the Board does set educational priorities have made career education a priority. Some states indicated career education to be an "indirect" or "sub-" priority under a "broader foundation program." One state reported that the Board does not set priorities.

Basis for allocation of funds to LEAs. Forty-three states said they already have a system or are in the process of setting up a system for LEA application for career education funds. Typically states inform LEAs through letter or other documentation of the availability of career education funds and request that applications be submitted using a system already established within the state.

Basis for allocating career education funds to LEAs varies somewhat. Most states have some kind of allocation plan ranging from competitive, RFP, general, set priorities, equal division, grants, panel selection, to follow P.L. 95-207. These descriptors primarily reflect each state's unique adaptation of commonly recognized allocation plans. For example, one state indicated P.L. 95-207 funds will be allocated on a competitive basis, using a formula. One of the components of the formula will be whether the LEA has already started its career education effort. Since "we have only $100,000 to put into the LEAs, we feel it best to put that money into those who haven't started career education yet." Another state indicated it will go with "$[illegible],000 in grants to reach more schools and have a greater impact. With Federal money, about 30-35 schools will be reached, but we can't reach 100% of the schools unless we get state or other monies." A third state indicated that the manner in which responding districts address designated state priorities will influence funding allocation. A point system will be used to select districts and schools, and the advisory committee will make the final selections. Some states are making allocations to Intermediate Education Agencies (IEAs), and they in turn are allocating to LEAs. All had determined their allocation plans; all were following P.L. 95-207 guidelines for these allocations.

Incentives for LEAs. Most states indicated they didn't have specific incentives for LEAs to develop career education programs except P.L. 95-207 funds. Use of Title IV monies for career education, other state funds, and inservice training were other reported incentives. Most states reported sending materials and documentation to LEAs to encourage local career education development. Whether this included sending the state plan itself is not known, but half of the states contacted reported some use of state plans by schools mostly for information and occasionally for developing local plans and programs. Many of the states had not yet distributed the state plan to the LEAs.

Biggest implementation problem. Most states anticipated that the reduction in P.L. 95-207 funds and/or insufficient staff would be their biggest implementation problems. Only nine states indicated they will use P.L. 95-207 funds to hire additional staff. Other reported implementation problems were communicating career education to state staff and LEAs, evaluation, regulations, and in-house support to get the work done. Only one state indicated it didn't anticipate any problems.

## Implications

Some major implications which can be drawn from this survey of 44 states and the District of Columbia are:

(1) All states surveyed are currently actively pursuing career education to some extent and most are implementing their state plans for career education. Virtually all have attended to some of the objectives scheduled for year one completion. Indications are that some states are willing and able to implement the objectives independent of specific federal funds such as those of P.L. 95-207. Possibly these states have, as Hoyt put it, "someone to 'ramrod' the career education effort." Other states report lack of funds as a reason for not making progress on their listed objectives.

---

*Hoyt, Kenneth B. (Monographs on Career Education) Refining the Career Education Concept. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 1976. P. 7.

(2) All states surveyed indicated that there is some current career education activity at the LEA level. Much of this activity had started as early as the 1960s and continues today independent of P.L. 93-380 and 95-207 thrusts. Other activity was stimulated by the recent legislation and promise of funds. Many states specifically indicated that interest in career education is there (LEA level, general population) but that financial support and administrative support are needed to operationalize that interest.

(3) All states surveyed plan to continue career education implementation. Primary evidence for this is their efforts to obtain P.L. 95-207 funding via state plan development and revision, and through submission of assurances to the Commissioner through OCE. Willingness to participate in the state plan assessment project was part of this effort. Most states were very cooperative and receptive to project suggestions and expressed gratitude for the P.L. 93-380 and 95-207 guidelines developed by the project for plan revision and as general references. Many states have specifically stated either that they already have been implementing career education, particularly where short-range plans or objectives were involved, or that they have "passed readiness and are currently into implementation."

By the end of the project year, most of the states had completed revision of their plans to meet the requirements of P.L. 95-207, in most cases leaning heavily on the Guidelines developed by this project's staff to direct their revisions. The biggest problem anticipated in implementing the state plans was deciding which objectives to implement since reduced funding often precludes total program implementation.

## Chapter V

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

### Summary

This report has presented an analysis of the assessment of 49 state and territory plans for career education as they reflect the intent of Public Law 93-380 and its Rules and Regulations. The elements and criteria used to assess state plans were, with a few exceptions, taken from P.L. 93-380 and its Rules and Regulations. Such elements and criteria were supplemented with criteria reflected in documents made available to the states by OCE and CCSSO. Guidelines for applying criteria to assessment of state plans were developed for each criterion.

Draft reports of assessments of state plans were submitted to state coordinators of career education for review. Twenty-eight of the 49 states submitted revisions and/or addenda to make their plans more nearly conform with the requirements of P.L. 93-380. These revisions/addenda resulted in improved element ratings for 25 of the 28 states and brought from 23 to 30 the number of states with average ratings of adequate or better across elements.

Besides assessment of state plans, project staff conducted site visits and examined planning documents to identify problems encountered and solutions attempted in the development of state plans. These problems tended to relate to use of advisory committees, conducting comprehensive needs assessments, and specifying sources of funding. Several solutions are suggested in Chapter III.

Another project task was to determine status of implementation of state plans as well as readiness to implement the plans. This inquiry showed that all states that had submitted state plans for review and assessment had some state activity in career education, and most had made considerable progress in implementation of their plans even though they had not yet received P.L. 95-207 funds. All declared that they were ready to implement their plans as soon as funds were received.

Guidelines for states to follow in revising their plans to meet the requirements of P.L. 95-207 were developed by project staff and were provided to all state coordinators of career education. These guidelines were well received, with a number of states observing that such guidelines for P.L. 93-380 would have been most helpful if they had been received before plan development was begun.

A final task of the project was to develop a model state plan. Since most states had already developed their plans when this project began, and since many were already in the process of revising their plans to meet the requirements of P.L. 95-207, it appeared more appropriate to develop a document on Model State Plan Characteristics: Guidelines for Refining State Plans.

## Conclusions

Based on experience gained from assessing 49 state plans for career education project staff offer a few observations. These observations relate primarily to the use of P.L. 93-380 as a mechanism for assessing the extent to which state plans developed under the law adequately reflect the intent of the law.

If the Law and its Rules and Regulations are to be used to determine effective use of funds allocated under that Law, the Law must be written in a clear, unambiguous manner. Two elements of the Law, needs assessment (element B) and evaluation (element F), serve to illustrate this point. The Rules and Regulations of P.L. 93-380 contain few criteria related to needs assessment. Examination of how states conducted their needs assessment revealed two points of interest: (1) states generally were rated "Weak" in conducting a needs assessment; and (2) states did not adequately use OCE-provided supplemental resources in planning and conducting the needs assessment. Further, state coordinators objected to the use of criteria from supplemental documents as a basis for assessing the needs assessment portion of their state plans. It is clear that states relied almost totally on the letter of the law. Analysis of the Law and its Rules and Regulations indicates, however, that these documents do not clearly communicate to the states what would be required to adequately meet the intent of the law with respect to the needs assessment.

A similar statement can be made about the treatment of evaluation in the Law and its Rules and Regulations (element F). Element F requires a state plan to specify plans for evaluating the effectiveness of career education inputs, processes and outcomes in local education agencies and in personnel training programs. The fact that this element is broad and lacks sufficient specificity to provide direction to the states is borne out by the poor rating of state plans in the area of input evaluation at both the SEA and LEA levels. Many questions of clarification were asked by state coordinators regarding this element. Project staff also experienced some confusion in developing guidelines for states on this element. It was unclear what was meant by evaluation of inputs as well as where the line of responsibility should be drawn between the SEA and LEAs for this function.

Despite the fact that specific guidelines (other than those implicit in the Law and its Rules and Regulations) were not available to the states during the development of their plans, 23 of the 49 states received an overall rating of "Adequate" or better on their initial draft. The fact that 28 of the 49 chose to submit revisions and/or addenda to improve their plans in terms of the criteria developed by this project attests to general interest in career education. Since 30 of the 49 final state plans rated at or above the midpoint of the distribution, it may be concluded that these plans generally are of good quality and provide a sound foundation for starting the implementation of career education under P.L. 95-207.

# APPENDIX A

- Letter to State Coordinators of Career Education Accompanying Draft Assessment Reports
- Assessment Report Form
- Guidelines for Applying Criteria to Assessment of State Plans
- Letter to Chief State School Officers Accompanying Final Assessment Reports
- Letter to State Coordinators of Career Education Accompanying Final Assessment Reports

**SWRL EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT**
4665 LAMPSON AVENUE LOS ALAMITOS, CALIFORNIA 90720 TELEPHONE 598-7661 AREA CODE 213 TELEX 65-6319

April 16, 1979

(LETTER ACCOMPANYING ASSESSMENT REPORTS)

Enclosed is the draft of our assessment of the Plan for Career Education dated 1978. This work has been done under our Contract (No. 300-78-0249) with the U.S. Office of Education. That contract requires us to: (1) assess State Plans for career education in terms of their compliance with the requirements of P.L. 93-380 and provide each State with a report on the assessment of its plan, (2) provide guidance to states in terms of modifying and/or extending their plans to comply with the requirements of P.L. 95-207, and (3) develop a model State Plan to serve as a guide to States wishing to refine their own plans further.

The completion of modifications of State Plans based on this assessment, and on the guidance provided for compliance with P.L. 95-207 at the earliest possible date is especially important. As you know, P.L. 95-207 calls for each State to submit its plan to the Office of Education on or before July 1, 1979. These plans must then be reviewed for adequacy, strengthened where necessary, and, after approval by the Commissioner, funded--all this before October 1, 1979. This task is likely to be impossible unless the plans submitted before July 1 are already adequate. The Office of Education staff feels that the SWRL project, with its individual report sent directly to you, is your best opportunity to strengthen the weak spots and to ensure that the plan you submit is a good one. Your plan has been analyzed according to the criteria shown on the assessment form, and these criteria have been approved by the Office of Career Education Staff. Guidelines used to conduct these assessments are enclosed to help you know where your Plan needs to be strengthened.

The assessment report is being sent to you in draft form to ask you whether or not we have misinterpreted or omitted any of the information in your Plan. Although many States sent various documents in addition to the State Plan, these documents were not included in the assessment unless they were clearly identified as a part of the Plan. Also, some of the Plans are voluminous and the style of organization varies widely. Therefore, it is possible to have missed or misinterpreted some part of your presentation.

Please review the enclosed draft assessment carefully and let us hear from you within two weeks of the date of this letter, if you think there are misinterpretations or omissions. If we have not heard from you by that date, we will assume that our assessment is accurate, and we will type the report in final form. That report will then be mailed to you and, as required by the Contract, to your Chief State School Officer. You may wish to discuss this with your Chief State School Officer so she/he will understand the reasons for, and the nature of, the assessment. Please be assured that we are trying to be helpful in pointing out where your State Plan is already strong or adequate and where it can be improved. We all want each State to have the best possible foundation on which to build its own program in Career Education, and we will greatly appreciate your cooperation in helping us assess your plan accurately.

Cordially,

Anita M. Mitchell

Anita M. Mitchell, Director
Assessment of State Plans for
Career Education

AMM:ls

Enclosure

State: ____________ Date of Review: ____________

Elements of State Plans for Career Education as Presented in P.L. 93-380.

A. Presents SEA's definition of career education and the conceptual base upon which career education in the State rests.

Criteria:

1. Definition and conceptual base include the following concepts and characteristics:

| | Page(s) | Scale | Comments/Summary |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. identifying career education as a systematic, continuous sequence . . . . . . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |
| b. identifying goal of preparing all children and youth, including handicapped and all other children who are educationally disadvantaged, for full participation in the society in which they are to live and work . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |
| c. providing career guidance and career development for all children including those with special needs, minority and educationally disadvantaged. . . . . . . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |
| d. increasing collaborative relationships between schools and society as a whole . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |
| e. relating subject matter of the curricula of schools to the needs of individuals to function fully in society . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |
| f. eliminating distinction between vocational and general and academic education . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |
| g. extending the education process beyond the school into the areas of employment and the community . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |
| h. fostering flexibility in attitudes, skills, and knowledge in order to enable persons to cope with accelerated change and obsolescence. . . . . . . . . . . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |
| i. treating career education as cutting across the entire curriculum, including basic skills, fine arts, practical arts, academic education and vocational education . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |
| j. identifying major desired learner outcomes . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |

Element A: strong adequate weak

|  | Page(s) | Scale | Comments/Summary |
|---|---|---|---|
| B. Describes the need for career education within the State. |  |  |  |
| 1. Reflects State's definition of career education in content of needs assessment instruments . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| 2. Reflects assessment of the career education needs of all students in the elementary, middle/junior high, and senior high schools of the State, including the special needs of handicapped and other educationally disadvantaged students . . . . . . . . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| 3. Reflects assessment of needs for pre- and in-service staff development . . . . . . . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| 4. Describes procedures used in the needs assessment . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| 5. Describes relationship of any prior needs assessment efforts and results to determination of current needs . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| *6.[1] Specifies sources from which content of items for needs assessment instruments were derived or sources from which the instruments themselves were obtained. . . . . . . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| *7. Includes assessment of resources (financial, human, technological, and material) needed for implementation of the Plan . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| *8. Includes students, parents, educators, business, industry, labor, government agencies as populations responding to the needs assessment instruments . . . . . . . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| *9. Uses available data (e.g., public opinion polls, research, demographic data, etc.) . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| * 10. Reflects advisory group input in planning needs assessment . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| * 11. Discusses procedures for setting priorities . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |

Element B: strong adequate weak

---

[1] Criteria preceded by a "*" are from the Belle Ruth Witkin document, "An Analysis of Needs Assessment Techniques for Educational Planning at State, Intermediate and District Levels," which was provided to State Coordinators by OCE.

|  | Page(s) | Scale | Comments/Summary |
|---|---|---|---|
| C. Describes the State's career education efforts and accomplishments to date to meet those needs identified in Element B, including an assessment of existing programs, practices, and materials. |  |  |  |
| 1. Describes past State CE activities and accomplishments related to the needs identified in Element B. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| 2. Includes assessment of existing plans, programs, practices, materials, and staff development efforts which relate to career education (e.g., counseling and guidance, vocational guidance, Title I, special education, CETA plans and activities, etc.). . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |

Element C: strong adequate weak

D. Specifies the objectives the State will seek to achieve in implementing career education within the State for 1977-78, and for 1977-78 through 1981-82.

| | Page(s) | Scale | Comments/Summary |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Specifies objectives for 1977-78 | | strong adequate weak | |
| 2. Specifies objectives for the five-year Plan, 1977-78 through 1981-82 | | strong adequate weak | |
| 3. Presents objectives which represent a reasonable, incremental progression toward defining a fully integrated program | | strong adequate weak | |
| *4. Presents objectives which are consistent with the State's conceptual base | | strong adequate weak | |
| *5. Presents objectives which are related to identified needs | | strong adequate weak | |
| *6. States objectives for all levels K-12 | | strong adequate weak | |
| *7. Defines objectives in measurable terms | | strong adequate weak | |
| *8. Presents only objectives which are attainable | | strong adequate weak | |

Element D: strong adequate weak

[1] Criteria preceded by an asterisk are implicit in material and documentation provided the states by the Office of Career Education and The Council of Chief State School Officers.

|  | Page(s) | Scale | Comments/Summary |
|---|---|---|---|
| E. Sets forth the strategies, activities, and resources to be utilized in implementing the one- and five-year plans in the following areas: |  |  |  |
| *1. Presents curriculum which reflects the effect/benefit of CE on: |  |  |  |
| a. experiential learning outside of the school building |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| b. vocational education |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| *2. Includes plans for career counseling, guidance, placement and follow-up |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| *3. Provides for meeting the CE needs of special groups, including the handicapped and other educationally disadvantaged students, and for eliminating the stereotyping of career opportunities by race or by sex |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| *4. Provides for involvement of the business/labor/industry/professional/government community in CE |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| *5. Provides for involving the home and family structure in CE |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| *6. Provides for training and retraining, both pre- and in-service, for personnel to enable them to implement CE |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| 7. Presents strategies, activities and resources which reflect a comprehensive implementation approach |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| 8. Includes provision for identifying existing and potential resources from across the United States that could be used to develop and implement career education within the State, including at least the following types of resources: career education instructional materials; educational facilities; educational personnel, career education programs and practices with potential for use within the State, including programs and practices designed to eliminate sex-role stereotyping in career choices; business, labor, industry, professional, government, and other community resources. |  | strong adequate weak |  |

Element E: strong adequate weak

[1] Criteria preceded by an asterisk are part of Element E as it appears in the rules and regulations for P.L. 93-380.

F. Specifies plans for evaluating the effectiveness of career education inputs, processes and outcomes in local education agencies and in personnel training programs.

| | Page(s) | Scale | Comments/Summary |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Includes procedures for identifying and recording inputs (e.g., federal funds, State funds, personnel, etc.) at the SEA level . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |
| 2. Provides guidance for identifying and recording inputs at the LEA level . . . . . . . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |
| 3. Includes procedures for monitoring and recording administration and implementation processes at the SEA level . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |
| 4. Provides guidance for monitoring and recording LEA administration and implementation processes . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |
| 5. Includes procedures for evaluating the extent to which the major desired outcomes of the State Plan are accomplished . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |
| 6. Includes plans for monitoring the extent to which LEAs' major desired outcomes are accomplished . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |
| 7. Includes procedures for evaluating inputs, processes and outcomes of personnel training programs at the State level . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |

Element F: strong adequate weak

| | Page(s) | Scale | Comments [illegible]mary |
|---|---|---|---|
| G. Specifies plans for disseminating information about career education, career education practices and products, and the results of career education efforts to interested persons within the State. | | | |
| 1. Includes plans for State dissemination to a range of populations concerned with career education (e.g., post-secondary, business, labor, industry, community etc.) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |
| 2. Includes schedules of State dissemination activities . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |
| 3. Includes State dissemination strategies . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |
| 4. Provides guidance for LEA dissemination activities . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |

Element G: strong adequate weak

|  | Page(s) | Scale | Comments/Summary |
|---|---|---|---|
| H. Specifies the funding that will be needed to implement the various components of the one year and five year plans and the sources of the necessary funding, where these sources are available. |  |  |  |
| 1. Specifies funding needed to implement each program component (e.g., administration, staff development, etc.) for each year of the one year and five year plans . . . . . . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| 2. Specifies current and projected federal and state sources of funds which will support implementation of components of the Plan . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| 3. Presents realistic costs for implementation . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |

Element H: strong adequate weak

| | Page(s) | Scale | Comments/Summary |
|---|---|---|---|
| I. Shows relationship of the State Plan for Career Education to career education activities being carried out and contemplated in post-secondary and adult education settings. | | | |
| 1. Presents guidelines for LEA coordination with other community education agencies, organizations, and institutions . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |
| 2. Evidences relationships with other agencies in part by memberships on SEA Advisory Councils, Boards, etc. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |
| 3. Addresses SEA coordination with teacher/counselor training institutions . . . . . . . . . | | strong adequate weak | |

Element I: strong adequate weak

|  | Page(s) | Scale | Comments/Summary |
|---|---|---|---|
| J. Specifies the manner in which the plan is to be implemented and administered by the SEA, which: |  |  |  |
| *1. includes allocation of resources . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| *2. includes management of activities . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| *3. includes provision of assistance to others within the State . . . . . . . . . . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| *4. includes staffing for career education within the SEA . . . . . . . . . . . . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| *5. includes relationship of CE Plan to other planning efforts at the State level (e.g., Vocational Education State Plan, Title III State Plan, etc.) . . . . . . . . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| 6. specifies monitoring checkpoints in the management plan . . . . . . . . . . . . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| 7. specifies the type(s) of data that will be collected to assess effectiveness of administrative procedures . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |
| 8. specifies procedures for review of implementation plan . . . . . . . . . . . . . . |  | strong adequate weak |  |

Element J: strong adequate weak

---

[1] Criteria preceded by an asterisk are part of Element J as it appears in the rules and regulations for P.L. 93-380.

SUMMARY

A. |_____|_____|_____|_____|
strong adequate weak

B. |_____|_____|_____|_____|
strong adequate weak

C. |_____|_____|_____|_____|
strong adequate weak

D. |_____|_____|_____|_____|
strong adequate weak

E. |_____|_____|_____|_____|
strong adequate weak

F. |_____|_____|_____|_____|
strong adequate weak

G. |_____|_____|_____|_____|
strong adequate weak

H. |_____|_____|_____|_____|
strong adequate weak

I. |_____|_____|_____|_____|
strong adequate weak

J. |_____|_____|_____|_____|
strong adequate weak

## Guidelines for Applying Criteria to Assessment of State Plans

A.

1. Since many States use one of OCE's definitions of career education (the definitions changed slightly from one OCE publication to later publications), and since none of those definitions contains all the sub-criteria specified in P.L. 93-380, "definition" is interpreted to include the discussion which surrounds the definition. This discussion frequently includes statements of belief, direction and/or perspective that address the additional sub-criteria. However, if a sub-criterion is not addressed in the definition/conceptual base section of the Plan but does appear in other parts of the Plan, the assessment report would recommend that, e.g., " . . . the reference to __________ on p. ___ should also appear in this section to show that the State considers it to be a part of the definition and/or conceptual base." For purpose of rating, sub-criteria have been met only if they are explicitly stated in whatever section addresses the definition/conceptual base (an exception to this is sub-criterion J). This section may be labeled "Introduction," "Purpose," "Definition," etc.

"Conceptual base" is interpreted to include the definition and those sub-criteria listed, with particular emphasis on major desired learner outcomes; in other words, what the State expects the program to do for students. Some States list the learner outcomes in a different section. This is acceptable as far as the rating is concerned, but the outcomes should be referenced in the definition/conceptual base section.

Subcriteria

a. Strong: Specifically includes this concept.

Adequate: The concept is implicit in one or more statements, e.g., "Career Education concepts are infused into each curriculum at each grade level."

Weak: The concept is missing or is addressed in such a way that it does not represent a systematic and continuous CE sequence.

b. Strong: Handicapped and other disadvantaged is specified. Concept of full participation in the society in which they live and work is specified.

Adequate: Handicapped and other disadvantaged students are included, but it is not clear that the purpose of such inclusion is to enhance their ability "to fully participate in the society. . . ."

Weak: Does not include specific reference to handicapped and disadvantaged children. Merely specifying "all children" is not enough.

c. Strong: Specifically states the concept in this section. Includes career guidance, career development, all children and specifically includes those with special needs, such as minority and educationally handicapped.

Adequate: Includes career guidance or career development for all children, specifically including those with special needs.

Weak: Concept missing, or stated in such a way that it does not constitute a program thrust for the benefit of all children.

d. Strong: Specifies kinds of collaboration to be pursued with identified segments of society (e.g., business/labor/industry; higher education; other public agencies, etc.).

Adequate: Specifies the need for collaboration with identified segments of society (see above) but does not indicate what constitutes such collaboration.

Weak: Criterion missing, or limited to statements such as, "CE, reaches beyond the school into the community."

e. Strong: Contains all elements of this concept, including the relationship between curricula and functioning in life roles beyond that of student and worker.

Adequate: Specifies that CE is to be part of each curriculum, but does not address the relationship of the subject matter of the curricula to work and other life roles.

Weak: Criterion missing or only implied.

f. Strong: Defines CE as integral to all education, including vocational, general, and academic.

Adequate: States that vocational education is not the same as career education but is included in career education.

Weak: Concept missing or only broadly implicit.

g. Strong: Specifies that career education for each student includes training and/or experience in employment and other community settings.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Adequate: | Refers to the use of community facilities and resources for career education but does not specify that such experience is to be part of each student's CE. |
| | Weak: | Concept missing or failure to link students' experience in the community to CE, e.g., "Provide work experience opportunities for students." |
| h. | Strong: | Explicitly recognizes the accelerated change and obsolescence students will experience, and acknowledges the State's responsibility to prepare students for these conditions by helping them develop functional attitudes, skills and knowledge. |
| | Adequate: | Addresses development of attitudes, skills and knowledge and accelerated change and obsolescence, but does not relate the two. |
| | Weak: | Concept not addressed, or only one part of concept addressed. |
| i. | Strong: | Specifically states that CE cuts across or is infused into each curricular area at each grade level. (May or may not specify the subject areas listed in the criterion). |
| | Adequate: | States that career education is included in every subject area (but does not specify in every curriculum). |
| | Weak: | Concept not addressed, or so ambiguously or weakly stated that impact on each subject area at each grade level cannot be inferred. |

j. Strong: Major desired CE learner outcomes are specified (or referenced) in this section. Outcomes include knowledges, attitudes and skills related at least to self-understanding, understanding of the world of work, and planning and decisionmaking skills.

Adequate: Learner outcomes appear in another section, and although they are related to the definition/conceptual base, this relationship is not addressed.

Weak: Learner outcomes are missing, or are only vaguely related to State's definition/conceptual base.

B.

1. Strong: Instruments are presented (in Appendix or elsewhere in the Plan) or areas of content are specified (e.g., career planning and decision making: education, work, and leisure alternatives; life styles and personal satisfactions); areas reflect the State's definition of career education; no major areas are neglected.

Adequate: Instruments are presented or areas of content are specified, but some parts of the State's definition are not addressed.

Weak: If the Plan does not either specify the content of the needs assessment instrument(s) or include copies of the instruments in the Appendix, the Plan cannot be judged on this criterion. The rating would be "weak," with a recommendation that the Plan be revised to include this information.

2. Strong: Plan states that the needs of students from each of these populations were included in the assessment.

Adequate: Plan specifies that the needs of all these levels, and of handicapped were assessed, but does not specify other educationally disadvantaged students.

Weak: Not specified, or "all students," with no subpopulations specified.

3. Strong: Staff members were assessed in terms of their knowledge of career education concepts and practices.

Adequate: Staff members were assessed in terms of the amount of their training in career education, and/or in terms of their perception of their needs for pre- and inservice.

Weak: Staff members were not assessed to determine their need for pre- and inservice.

4. Strong: Procedures used in conducting the needs assessment are specified, and include:

- sampling plan
- instrument selection/development
- data collection and management
- data interpretation and use

Adequate: Procedures are discussed, but there is not enough detail to insure the credibility of the assessment.

Weak: Procedures are not discussed, or are only vaguely described, e.g., "A sample of students from three grade levels was included in the assessment."

5. Some States have not conducted needs assessments prior to the development of their Plan. Others may have conducted such assessments but do not report them in their Plan. Therefore this item can be completed only for those States that report prior needs assessments.

Strong: Reports results of prior needs assessments, including dates of the assessment and populations assessed, and specifies how the results were used in the current determination of needs.

Adequate: Reports that results of a prior needs assessment were among data used to determine current needs, but does not discuss how they were used.

Weak: Reports that a prior needs assessment was conducted, but does not specify whether the results were used to determine current needs.

6. Strong: If published instruments related to career development/ career choice were used, identifies them. If locally developed instruments were used, specifies where the item content came from (e.g., The California Career Development Model; the Ohio State Career Development Model; State's learner outcomes; Advisory Committee, etc.)

Adequate: Identifies the source(s) of some, but not all of the items or instruments (e.g., "Some of the items were taken from the Career and Occupational Development Test.").

Weak: Source is not specified, or is only vaguely indicated.

7. Strong: Includes assessment of resources--e.g., financial, human, technological, material--both what is available and what will be needed for a comprehensive career education program. Presents a statement of discrepancy between what the resource assessment revealed, and what will be needed to carry out the State Plan.

Adequate: Describes a resource assessment but does not discuss the discrepancy between what is and what is needed (or describes the needs without stating how they were derived).

Weak: No resource assessment discussed.

8. Strong: At least those populations specified in the criterion were sampled.

Adequate: Students, staff, parents and community are specified in the sample.

Weak: If any of these groups was left out, the criterion should be marked weak: students, staff, parents, community.

9. Strong: Specifies existing data sources used, and states what these sources contributed to determination of the need.

Adequate: Specifies existing data sources used, but does not specify what these sources contributed to determination of the need.

Weak: Does not make use of existing data sources, or lists data sources that do not appear to be related to their determination of need (e.g., birth-rate).

10. Strong: Discussion of needs assessment or discussion of advisory group specifically states how this group participated in the planning of the needs assessment.

Adequate: States that the advisory group participated in planning the needs assessment but does not indicate how they were involved.

Weak: Not specified.

11. Strong: Uses discrepancy analysis as basis for setting priorities.

Adequate: Discusses priority setting but does not relate this to discrepancy analysis.

Weak: Priority setting is not discussed.

C.

1. Strong: State's list of efforts and accomplishments to date includes reference to their relationship to the needs identified in the needs assessment.

   Adequate: State's past efforts and accomplishments are listed, and although their relationship to needs identified in the needs assessment is not stated, it is reasonably apparent.

   Weak: Either no list of efforts and accomplishments is presented, or the list bears only general relationship to the needs identified in the needs assessment.

2. Strong: Reflects a broad look at all State programs/practices, etc., in terms of their contribution to career education.

   Adequate: Describes results of assessment of State's efforts in career education, but does not reflect a broad look at all State programs/practices, etc.

   Weak: No evidence of assessment of existing programs/practices, etc.

D.

1. Although the year 1977-78 is specified in the law, many State Plans were completed after 1977-78, and begin objectives with 1978-79. This fact should be noted in the comments/summary because of this criterion being in the law, but the Plan should not be faulted for beginning with 1978-79, and planning through 1982-83. In other words, note compliance/non-compliance with this criterion, but rate as "strong" to "needs improvement" regardless of whether 1977-78 or 1978-79 objectives are specified as first-year objectives.

   Strong: Presents objectives which the State will attain during the first year of implementation; objectives are directly related to the priority needs identified.

   Adequate: Objectives are presented, but not all priority needs are addressed.

   Weak: Objectives are not presented, or objectives do not appear to be directly related to identified needs.

2. LEA objectives alone do not satisfy this criterion. SEA objectives must be stated. Objectives should be specified for each of the four successive years (not a four-year block).

   Strong: Objectives for 1977-78 through 1981-82 are listed, and although some may be process objectives, there are outcome objectives which would facilitate implementation of career education in all the schools of the State by the end of the five-year period.

Adequate: Objectives for each of the four years are written as process objectives, e.g., "Hold workshops for LEA personnel to plan career education programs, in each region of the State"; if no outcome objective is stated, (e.g., __% of the LEAs will complete plans for career education programs), the evaluation procedures may furnish adequate information from which outcomes may be inferred (e.g., Evaluation: Analysis of records of LEA plans filed with the SEA). In such a case the criterion should be rated adequate, with a recommendation that desired outcomes be stated.

Weak: Objectives for the four years are not stated or they are stated for the four-year block of time.

3. Strong: Objectives represent implementation of career education in all schools in the State by the end of the fifth year. (For instance, if the SEA planned to achieve implementation in 10% of the schools the first year, and 10% more each successive year, only 50% of the schools would be involved at the end of the fifth year).

Adequate: Objectives show incremental gains in implementation of carrer education throughout the State, but do not clearly show that all schools in the State will be involved in implementation of career education by the end of the fifth year.

Weak: Objectives are not presented by year and/or they do not reflect incremental progression toward a fully integrated program.

4. Strong: Objectives reflect each major component of the State's conceptual base (see Element A) (e.g., if the conceptual base included preparing handicapped for full participation in society, there must be one or more objectives addressing this concept).

   Adequate: Although objectives do not reflect every major component, they are consistent with the conceptual base.

   Weak: Objectives are not entirely consistent with the conceptual base.

5. Strong: Each identified need is addressed in the objectives.

   Adequate: Objectives are consistent with identified needs, but the match between needs and objectives is not clear.

   Weak: Objectives appear to be independent of identified needs.

6. Student outcome objectives (K-12) may appear in a section other than that labeled "objectives," but they should appear. Desired learner outcomes may be stated in such a way that they constitute student objectives. They may appear under sections labeled "guidelines" for LEAs. This is appropriate because unless the law gives them the authority (and few States have such laws) the SEA has no jurisdiction over the LEA's implementation of a career education plan and therefore should not be faulted for leaving it to the LEA to define its own objectives. However, somewhere in the Plan desired student outcomes should be stated, and those objectives should cover all levels, K-12.

Strong: Separate objectives are specified for elementary, junior high/middle school, high school.

Adequate: Although objectives are not divided into levels (elementary/junior high, etc.), they address a broad range of career development levels.

Weak: No K-12 objectives are presented, or objectives presented are limited to one level (e.g., high school).

7. Strong: For process objectives, the attainment could be verified. For outcome objectives, populations are specified, and what the populations will be able to do as a result of the planned intervention is either measurable or observable (e.g., "LEA coordinators will complete a local plan," not "LEA coordinators will understand how to complete a local plan.")

Adequate: Major objectives are measurable.

Weak: Few or none of the objectives are measurable.

8. Strong: Objectives are neither too ambitious nor too trivial. They represent reasonable and desirable levels of attainment.

Adequate: Major objectives are attainable.

Weak: Objectives are too ambitious.

E.

Although the target of the State Plan is implementation of CE in all the LEAs in the State, this Element addresses the strategies, activities and resources the State will use in implementing its Plan. The State may suggest strategies, activities and resources for the LEAs to use, and train LEAs in the use of such strategies, activities and resources, but we are looking here at the strategies the State will use to encourage LEA implementation.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| * 1. | Strong: | States that these concepts will be incorporated in State's curriculum guides, or includes these concepts in guidelines for LEAs, and indicates how the State will administer these guidelines. |
| | Adequate: | The concepts are included in the strategies, etc., but there is no indication as to how this will be translated into practice in the LEAs. |
| | Weak: | Concepts are not addressed. |
| * 2. | Strong: | Addresses all four: counseling, guidance, placement and followup. |
| | Adequate: | Addresses counseling and guidance only. |
| | Weak: | Not addressed. |
| * 3. | Strong: | Gives specific strategies for meeting the special needs of handicapped and other educationally disadvantaged students, and specific strategies for eliminating stereotyping. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Adequate: | The Plan states that the special needs of handicapped and other educationally disadvantaged students will be met, and that efforts will be made to eliminate bias and stereotyping, but does not specify the strategies to be used. |
| | Weak: | Does not address this concept--or addresses only handicapped or only stereotyping. |
| * 4. | Strong: | Plan contains specific statements as to how these groups will be involved. |
| | Adequate: | States that these publics will be involved and gives at least one example. |
| | Weak: | Concept is not addressed, or is addressed with a non-specific statement, e.g., "Provide for the involvement of the business/labor/etc. community." |
| * 5. | Strong: | States how the home and family structure will be involved. |
| | Adequate: | States that the home and family structure will be involved, but does not state how. |
| | Weak: | Concept not addressed. |
| * 6. | Strong: | Presents strategies for working with the teacher/counselor/administrator training institutions to provide preservice in CE; and presents strategies for inservice training of SEA, IEA and LEA personnel. |

Adequate: Provides for inservice but not preservice training.

Weak: Does not address this concept, or presents plans that include only one level of inservice training (SEA, IEA or LEA),

7. This criterion requires that the Plan specifies strategies, activities and resources to be utilized in achieving these comprehensive programs.

Strong: Strategies, activities, and resources section satisfies these subcriteria:

a. proceeds in small steps from little or no CE to a fully integrated program

b. includes tasks and timelines which assure that the Plan will be implemented effectively

c. reflects the concepts represented by subsections 1 through 6 of this Element.

d. specifies roles of SEA, IEAs and LEAs in the implementation process

e. represents an outreach that will include all IEAs and LEAs in dissemination/training/planning/implementing and evaluating cycles.

Adequate: Addresses each of the subcriteria a through e, but lacks specificity.

Weak: Not all these subcriteria are addressed.

8. Strong: Identifies sources explored for existing and potential resources, and these sources extend beyond the State. All types of resources (a through e) are specified.

Adequate: Identifies a range of sources, but all are in State or in neighboring States. Does not specify types of resources.

Weak: Identification and accessing of resources is not addressed.

F. The State must evaluate its own efforts. Also, the State Plan should contain guidelines for LEA evaluation of their CE efforts, as well as training and technical assistance to ensure the credibility of such evaluation. Both of these approaches are addressed in these criteria.

1. Strong: Procedures provide for identifying and recording sources and uses of a broad array of career education inputs (funds, personnel, etc.).

   Adequate: Lists career education inputs (funds, personnel, etc.) but does not explain sources and uses.

   Weak: Does not address career education inputs.

2. Strong: Guidelines for LEAs provide for identification and recording of sources and uses of inputs.

   Adequate: Guidelines for LEAs provide for identifying inputs but do not explain sources and uses.

   Weak: Does not present LEA guidelines in this area.

3. Strong: Procedures are presented and include:

   a. standards

   b. timelines

   c. person(s) responsible

   Adequate: Procedures are presented and include some but not all of the elements (a, b, c) above.

   Weak: Procedures are not given.

4. Strong: Presents guidelines for LEA evaluation of career education processes, including standards.

   Adequate: Addresses the need for LEA evaluation of career education processes, but does not suggest standards.

   Weak: Does not present guidelines for LEA evaluation of processes.

5. Strong: For each major objective of the State Plan, a viable evaluation procedure is specified.

   Adequate: Evaluation procedures are provided for process objectives only.

   Weak: There is no provision for evaluating the extent to which the major objectives of the State Plan are accomplished.

6. Strong: Monitoring plans are specified and include:

   a. specific evidence SEAs will need to determine extent of LEA attainment of objectives
   b. how this evidence will be obtained
   c. staff who will be assigned to monitoring functions
   d. timelines for monitoring activities

   Adequate: Monitoring plans are presented but lack detail.

   Weak: No monitoring plans are presented.

7. Personnel training programs are interpreted to mean those provided by the SEA, either for their own staffs or for IEA or LEA staffs.

   Strong: Presents specific procedures for evaluating inputs, processes and outcomes of State-sponsored personnel training programs.

Adequate: Presents strategies for evaluating outcomes of SEA personnel training programs, but does not present strategies for evaluating inputs and processes.

Weak: Does not address evaluation of personnel training programs.

G.

1. Strong: Dissemination plans specify audiences including parents, postsecondary education, IEAs, LEAs, business, labor, industry and other community agencies/organizations.

   Adequate: Specifies dissemination to IEAs, LEAs, postsecondary education, parents, and community (sub-populations of community not specified).

   Weak: Does not address dissemination, or dissemination is limited to IEA and LEA personnel.

2. Strong: Schedules include times (e.g., quarterly), locations (e.g., regional), and audiences (e.g., sub-populations listed in (1) above).

   Adequate: Lists audiences and strategies but provides incomplete schedule information.

   Weak: Does not provide schedule for dissemination activities except those directed to IEAs and LEAs.

3. Strong: Strategies for dissemination to each sub-population are specified and are appropriate and feasible for intended audiences (e.g., regional workshops for IEA, LEA personnel; TV spots for general public; presentations at business conferences, etc.).

   Adequate: Strategies for dissemination to some, but not all, audiences are listed and are appropriate. (If a State Plan was Adequate on (1) above, it cannot be Strong on this one. Strong is reserved for those Plans that name a full range of audiences for dissemination, and specify strategies for dissemination to each.)

*Weak*: Dissemination strategies are not given, or are limited to LEAs and IEAs.

4. *Strong*: Guidelines for LEA dissemination include a range of populations in the dissemination network.

*Adequate*: Guidelines include suggested procedures for LEA dissemination activities, but do not suggest a range of populations as targets for dissemination.

*Weak*: Dissemination is not addressed or dissemination activities are not specified.

H. A component is defined as a program cost segment (e.g., administration, staff development, etc.).

1. Strong: This may be satisfied in one of two ways: a) estimated cost following presentation of each component of the strategies for meeting objectives of the State Plan, or b) a separate budget, with amounts keyed to specific components. Funding needs are specified for each of the 5 years.

   Adequate: Funding needs are specified for each of the 5 years. Cost breakdowns are given by strategy or activity, but are not aggregated into program cost segments.

   Weak: No budget, or only annual total dollar needs are given.

2. Strong: Sources (including other unit budgets of the SEA) and projected amounts are specified and reflect a) efforts to ensure implementation of the Plans without total dependence on federal funds, and b) efforts to share available funds across programs that share common goals.

   Adequate: Specifies federal and state CE funds only, and reflects efforts to ensure implementation of the Plans without total dependence on federal funds.

   Weak: Sources of funds are not specified or are limited to CEIA.

3. Costs projected should be examined in light of strategies/staff. (E.g., $300 for 5 regional workshops would obviously be too little; $50,000 for 5 regional workshops would be too much.)

   Strong: Projected costs reflect careful analysis of needed resources, with justifications.

   Adequate: Costs appear to be reasonable, but no justification is given.

   Weak: Costs are too high or too low for resources to be used.

I.

1. **Strong:** Addresses the need for coordination with other education agencies, and suggests specific strategies for achieving such coordination. Agencies are named and include colleges/universities, teacher/counselor/administrator training institutions, adult and continuing education, and community colleges.

   **Adequate:** Specifies procedures for coordination with teacher/counselor/administrator training institutions only.

   **Weak:** Does not address coordination with teacher/counselor/administrator training institutions, or makes a simple statement such as "Coordinate with training institutions," but does not give procedures.

2. **Strong:** Advisory Councils, Boards, etc. are listed, members are identified by role/institution, and all education agencies listed in (1) above are included. States that these representatives were included to achieve coordination with their institutions.

   **Adequate:** Same as "Strong" except that no statement is made to indicate that members were selected to achieve coordination.

   **Weak:** Panel members are not identified, or do not include representatives from the education agencies named in (1).

3. **Strong:** Coordination with teacher/counselor/administrator training institutions is integral to the Plan, including procedures, not just "Teacher/counselor/administrator training institutions will receive copies of the State Plan."

Adequate: Specifically states that the State will work with/communicate with teacher/counselor/administrator training institutions to ensure adequacy of pre-service training for implementing CE programs, but does not specify procedures.

Weak: Does not address coordination with teacher/counselor/administrator training institutions or presents only one-way communication, e.g., "Teacher/counselor training institutions will receive copies of the State Plan."

J. Since implementation of the State Plan is covered in Element E, this Element focuses on implementation of the administration plan--i.e., the management plan.

*1. Strong: Specifies the SEA's allocation of human, financial, material and technological resources by task or activity.

Adequate: Specifies allocation of two or three but not all four types of resources.

Weak: Does not specify resources, or specifies only one type of resource (e.g., State consultants).

*2. Strong: Presents a management plan which includes major administrative tasks and clearly indicates lines of authority and responsibility related to these tasks.

Adequate: Presents a management plan (including major administrative tasks) from which task management can be inferred.

Weak: Does not present a management plan, or management plan does not tell the reviewer how tasks will be managed.

*3. Strong: Presents a plan for assisting all LEAs in the development/implementation/evaluation of CE programs, either directly or through IEAs.

Adequate: Plan is presented but does not ensure assistance to all LEAs in the State.

Weak: Assistance is not addressed or is promised but no procedures are given.

*4. Strong: A State coordinator of CE is named, and additional staff members required/assigned for implementation of the Plan are specified (whether from CE or from other units within the State Department of Education). Roles/responsibilities of each are specified.

Adequate: A State coordinator of CE is named, along with staff required/assigned for implementation of the Plan, but roles/responsibilities are not specified.

Weak: No State coordinator of CE is named, or the person to coordinate implementation of the Plan is a regular State Department person who has had this responsibility added to his/her already full assignment.

*5. Strong: Relationships with other State Plans are described, e.g., how the CE Plan complements the Vocational Education Plan, etc.

Adequate: States that the CE Plan is related to specific other State Plans but does not describe these relationships.

Weak: Does not state that the CE Plan is related to other State Plans.

6. Strong: Presents procedures and timelines for monitoring administration of the State Plan.

Adequate: States that the State will monitor the administration of the Plan but does not give procedures or guidelines.

Weak: Monitoring functions are not addressed.

7. This criterion can be rated Strong or Adequate only if the State Plan contained management tasks (see *2).

Strong: Specifies types of data to be collected, (e.g., numbers of LEAs submitting draft plans; numbers of requests for technical assistance; etc) for each major administrative task.

Adequate: Specifies types of data to be collected for some but not all major administrative tasks.

Weak: Does not specify types of data to be collected.

8. Strong: Procedures for review of the implementation plan include use of results of the review.

Adequate: States that the implementation plan will be reviewed but does not give procedures.

Weak: Does not provide for review of implementation plan.

SWRL
SWRL EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
4665 LAMPSON AVENUE LOS ALAMITOS, CALIFORNIA 90720 TELEPHONE 598-7661 AREA CODE 213 TELEX 65-6319

(LETTER TO CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

ACCOMPANYING FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORTS)

As a follow up to the P.L. 93-380 Planning Grants provided for States to develop State Plans for Career Education, the Office of Career Education, through the Office of Evaluation and Dissemination, contracted with the Southwest Regional Laboratory (SWRL) to assess the degree to which State Plans completed under the Grants program met the requirements of P.L. 93-380.

The SWRL project staff analyzed P.L. 93-380 and its rules and regulations, listed Elements that were to be included in the State Plans, and developed criteria (derived from the law and from its rules and regulations) for assessing the State Plans.

A draft report of the assessment of each State Plan was sent to the State's Coordinator of Career Education for a validity check. Reports were modified, if warranted by the validity check, and were then finalized. We are deeply appreciative of the cooperation of your State Coordinator.

The final report for your State is enclosed for your information. A copy is being sent to your State Coordinator of Career Education. A copy of the Guidelines used in performing the assessment is also enclosed. If you have any questions, contact your State Coordinator and/or the undersigned.

Sincerely yours,

Anita M Mitchell

Anita M. Mitchell, Director
Assessment of State Plans
for Career Education

AMM:bj
Enclosure

SWRL

**SWRL EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT**
4665 LAMPSON AVENUE LOS ALAMITOS, CALIFORNIA 90720 TELEPHONE 598-7661 AREA CODE 213 TELEX 65-6319

(LETTER TO STATE COORDINATORS OF CAREER EDUCATION
ACCOMPANYING FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORTS)

Enclosed is the final report of our assessment of the Plan for Career Education for your State. A copy is being sent to your Chief State School Officer for his/her information.

We appreciate your cooperation with our project staff, and we sincerely hope that our review will be helpful to you as you revise your State Plan. Distribution of Career Education Incentive Act FY '80 funds will be contingent upon receipt of State Plans that comply with the requirements set forth in the law and in its rules and regulations.

If you have any questions, please write or telephone.

Sincerely yours,

Anita M. Mitchell

Anita M. Mitchell, Director
Assessment of State Plans
for Career Education

AMM:bj
Enclosure

## APPENDIX B

- Memo to State Coordinators of Career Education to Accompany Guidelines
- Elements and Criteria for P.L. 95-207 State Plans
- Guidelines for Adding to State Plans for Career Education to Comply with P.L. 95-207: The Career Education Incentive Act

**SWRL EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT**
4665 LAMPSON AVENUE LOS ALAMITOS, CALIFORNIA 90720 TELEPHONE 598-7661 AREA CODE 213 TELEX 65-6319

DATE: March 23, 1979

TO: State Coordinators of Career Education

FROM: Anita M. Mitchell, Director, Assessment of State Plans for Career Education

As required by contract with the Office of Education, the career education project staff of the Southwest Regional Laboratory has compiled a draft document (enclosed) which lists the elements and criteria to be included in a State Plan in order to qualify for funds under P.L. 95-207.

To assist you in making these requirements operational, we have prepared draft Guidelines for developing additions to your existing State Plans for Career Education to comply with P.L. 95-207. After July 1, P.L. 95-207 funds will be released only to those States whose Plans meet the requirements of P.L. 95-207.

A report of our assessment of your existing State Plan in terms of its compliance with P.L. 93-380 will be sent to you within the next few weeks. In the meantime, the enclosed documents will help you get started on the preparation of those sections for which P.L. 95-207, the Career Education Incentive Act, requirements go beyond the requirements of P.L. 93-380.

Although the enclosed documents are labeled "draft," we do not anticipate major changes, and we hope that they will be helpful to you.

AM:ms
Enclosures

## Elements and Criteria to be Included in State Plans for Career Education As Required by P.L. 95-207

A. Presents SEA's definition of career education and the conceptual base upon which career education in the State rests.

1. Definition and conceptual base include the following:

   a. recognizing the prime importance of work in our society.

   b. making education as preparation for work, and as a means of relating work values to other life roles (such as family life) a major goal of all who teach and all who learn.

   c. promoting equal opportunity in making career choices through the elimination of bias and stereotyping, including bias and stereotyping on account of race, sex, age, economic status, or handicap.

   d. integrating career education into the regular education programs offered in elementary and secondary schools in the State.

B. Describes the need for career education within the State.

(For this element, P.L. 95-207 does not add any requirements to those covered by P.L. 93-380.)

C. Describes the State's career education efforts and accomplishments to date to meet identified needs, including an assessment of existing programs, practices, and materials.

(For this element P.L. 95-207 does not add any requirements to those covered by P.L. 93-380.)

D. Specifies the objectives the State will seek to achieve in implementing career education within the State by the end of each fiscal year of funding, FY 79 through FY 83.

1. Presents objectives which provide for career education for students in elementary and secondary schools.

2. Presents objectives for overcoming bias and stereotyping, including bias and stereotyping on account of race, sex, age, economic status or handicap.

3. Presents objectives for increasing emphasis on career awareness, exploration, decision making and planning.

4. Presents objectives which reflect the concept of career education as preparation for work, and as a means of relating work values to other life roles and choices (such as family life).

5. Presents objectives which reflect integration of career education into the regular education programs offered in elementary and secondary schools in the State, not solely into the vocational education programs.

E. Sets forth the strategies (methods), activities and resources to be utilized in implementing the one- and five-year plans.

1. Includes methods for achieving each of the major objectives of the State Plan.

2. Specifies methods for assuring equal access of all students, including the handicapped and members of both sexes, to career education programs carried out under the State Plan.

3 Specifies methods for overcoming bias and stereotyping.

(E.g., a. purchase only materials free of bias and stereotyping

b. alert students and take measures to counteract bias and stereotyping in existing materials

c. give students opportunities to see nontraditional role models

d. develop materials free of bias and stereotyping.)

4. Specifies methods for developing comprehensive instructional strategies which include such provisions as the following:

a. begins in elementary and extends to adult

b. affects all instructional programs

c. provides awareness of the world of work

d. provides broad orientation to occupations

e. provides guidance and counseling for career decision making

f. provides job seeking skills

g. builds positive attitudes towards work.

5. Specifies methods for achieving a comprehensive approach in which specific functions to support and implement career education are performed by various types of people such as teachers; board members; counseling and guidance personnel; persons from business, labor, industry, the professions and government; community organizations; educational administrators; supervisors; parents; and career education coordinators.

6. Specifies methods for coordinating with other education program activities such as those performed by Vocational Education, Title I, CETA, etc.

7. Specifies methods which reflect use of a broad range of resources.

8. Includes guidelines suggesting methods to be used by LEAs in planning and implementing comprehensive career education programs.

F. Specifies plans for evaluating the effectiveness of career education inputs, processes and outcomes in local education agencies and in personnel training programs.

1. Provides proposed criteria to the Commissioner for evaluation of the extent to which the State will achieve the major objectives of the State Plan for each funded year.

2. Provides guidelines for specifying criteria LEAs might use for evaluating the extent to which LEAs will achieve the major objectives of their plans for each funded year.

G. Specifies plans for disseminating information about career education, career education practices and products, and the results of career education efforts to interested persons within the State.

(For this element, P.L. 95-207 does not add any requirements to those covered by P.L. 93-380.)

H. (P.L. 93-380: Specifies the funding that will be needed to implement the various components of the one-year and five-year plans and the sources of the necessary funding, where those sources are available.)

P.L. 95-207: Describes the methods by which the funds received under the Act will be used (consistent with Section 8 of P.L. 95-207) to implement the overall objectives in each fiscal year of funding.

1. Provides SEA plan for the use and expenditure of funds.

2. Reflects budget expenditures for career education out of State funds at least equal to those for the previous year.

3. Presents a budget consistent with the size, scope and duration of the project.

4. Presents budget which reflects federal funds not to exceed:

   100% for 1979
   75% for 1980
   50% for 1981, 82, 83.

5. Presents sources of funds for employing State personnel with Federal portion of funds not exceeding the following percentages:

   100% for 1979
   75% for 1980
   50% for 1981, 82, 83.

6. Presents sources of funds for State leadership and local implementation with Federal portion not exceeding:

   100% for 1979 and 1980
   75% for 1981
   50% for 1982
   25% for 1983.

7. Presents 1979 budget which reflects no more than 10% of Federal funds being used for State leadership activities.

8. Presents budget which reflects not more than 10% of Federal funds expended for employing additional personnel in 1979, and not more than 5% the following years.

9. Presents total budget which reflects not less than 15% for counseling, guidance, placement and follow-up.

10. Presents budget which reflects no more than 5% each year for the administration of the Act and for making model program grants.

11. Specifies funding sources and funds, including current and projected Federally funded projects which will support implementation of components of the Plan.

12. Specifies categorical allocation in the State budget to pay the nonfederal share of the costs of carrying out the State Plan for fiscal year 1980 and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years.

13. Includes timelines linking fiscal year objectives to fiscal year funds.

14. Specifies that public agencies will control funds, materials and equipment used for participation of nonpublic schools in the program.

15. Specifies which public agency will administer the use of funds, materials and equipment by nonpublic schools.

16. Uses CEIA funds only to pay the Federal share of the total costs of one or more of the following:

    a. employing such additional State educational agency personnel as may be required for the administration and coordination of programs under CEIA, including individuals experienced in:

        (1) problems of stereotyping and bias

        (2) guidance and counseling

    b. providing State leadership for career education in:

        (1) conducting inservice institutes for educational personnel

        (2) training local career education coordinators

        (3) collecting, evaluating, and disseminating career education materials on an intrastate and interstate basis with special emphasis on overcoming sex bias and stereotyping

        (4) conducting statewide needs assessment and evaluation studies

        (5) conducting statewide career education leadership conferences

        (6) engaging in collaborative relationships with other agencies of State government and with public agencies and private organizations representing business, labor, industry and the professions and organizations representing the handicapped, minority groups, women, and older Americans.

(7) promoting the adaptation of teacher-training curricula to the concept of career education by institutions of higher education located in the State

c. making payments to LEAs for comprehensive programs including:

(1) instilling career education concepts and approaches in the classroom

(2) developing and implementing comprehensive career guidance, counseling, placement, and follow-up services utilizing counselors, teachers, parents, and community resource personnel

(3) developing and implementing collaborative relationships with organizations representing the handicapped, minority groups, and women and with all other elements of the community, including the use of personnel from such organizations and the community as resource persons in schools and for student field trips into that community

(4) developing and implementing work experiences for students whose primary purpose is career exploration, if such work experiences are related to existing or potential career opportunities and do not displace other workers who perform such work

(5) employing coordinators of career education in local educational agencies or in combinations of such agencies (but not the individual school building level)

(6) training of local career education coordinators

(7) providing inservice education for educational personnel, especially teachers, counselors, and school administrators, designed to help such personnel to understand career education, to acquire competencies in the field of career education and to acquaint such personnel with the changing work patterns of men and women, ways of overcoming sex stereotyping in career education, and ways of assisting women and men to broaden their career horizons

(8) conducting institutes for members of boards of local educational agencies, community leaders, and parents concerning the nature and goals of career education

(9) purchasing instructional materials and supplies for career education activities

(10) establishing and operating community career education councils

(11) establishing and operating career education resource centers serving both students and the general public

(12) adopting, reviewing, and revising local plans for coordinating the implementation of the comprehensive program, and

(13) conducting needs assessments and evaluations

d. reviewing and revising the State Plan.

I. Shows relationship of the State Plan for Career Education to career education activities being carried out and contemplated in post-secondary and adult education settings.

(For this element, P.L. 95-207 does not add any requirements to those covered by P.L. 93-380.)

J. Specifies the manner in which the plan is to be implemented and administered by the SEA, including provision of adequate assurance that the requirements of Section 6 of P.L. 95-207, related to applications, nonfederal share costs, and review of plans, will be met in each fiscal year of funding after 1979.

1. Includes plans for integrating career education into regular educational programs in the State's elementary/secondary schools.
2. Provides for notification to State legislature and governor of SEA's application for funds.
3. Specifies designation of a State coordinator of career education who has prior experience in career education.
4. Provides adequate staffing for administration of the program, including one having experience with respect to discrimination and stereotyping, and one professionally trained in guidance and counseling.
5. Includes plans for continuous review and submission of amendments to the plans as necessary.
6. Provides for the establishment and use of a career education advisory group to provide advice and assistance during the development of the State Plan. This group shall contain members representing a range of populations such as:
    a. major units of the State educational agency, . . . the State Board of Vocational Education and the State system of higher education;
    b. other State governmental units
    c. business and industry
    d. labor
    e. institutions of higher education with educational personnel preparation programs
    f. school administrators
    g. counselors
    h. teachers
    i. vocational education personnel
    j. parents
    k. students

7. Sets forth policies and procedures which the State will follow to assure equal access of all students, including the handicapped and members of both sexes, to career education programs carried out under the State Plan.

    a. policies are specifically stated.

    b. SEA procedures for implementing the policies are stated.

    c. guidelines for LEA policies and procedures are included.

    d. handicapped students are assured the same career education opportunities as regular students.

    e. students and teachers from nonpublic schools are included in the program.

    f. nonpublic schools have been consulted in preparation of the plan.

    g. provides for receiving assurances from LEA to assure equal access of all students.

8. Provides for the elimination of bias based on race, sex, age, economic status, handicap, and religion by:

    a. providing that any new instructional materials and activities must be free of bias and stereotyping

    b. ensuring that administrative, teaching, counseling, and other school service practices are free of bias

    c. providing program range adequate to accommodate needs of all students in the school.

9. Includes plans for reporting to the Commissioner by 12/31 of each year beginning in 1980:

    a. analysis of extent to which State objectives have been met

    b. description of extent to which SEAs and LEAs are using State and local resources to achieve objectives

    c. extent to which CEIA funds have been used to achieve State objectives

    d. description of exemplary and non-successful programs funded, and analysis of reasons for success/failure.

10. Includes provisions for SEA administration of funds and property provided by the CEIA.

11. Provides that services to nonpublic school teachers and students shall be provided by employees of a public agency or through contract by such public agency with a person, an association, agency, or corporation independent of the nonpublic school and of any religious organization.

K.* Describes the methods by which the State will make payments to the LEAs of funds received under the Career Education Incentive Act (consistent with with Section 8(a), Paragraph 3, P.L. 95-207).

1. Indicates how Federal and State funds will be allocated to LEAs.
2. Specifies LEA application procedures.
3. Specifies procedures for reviewing applications.
4. Describes fair and equitable basis on which payments to LEAs will be allocated (specifies criteria), (forbids allocation on a per capita enrollment basis or through matching of local expenditures on a uniform percentage basis. Forbids denying funds to an LEA if the applicable jurisdiction in which such agency is located is making a reasonable tax effort solely because such agency is unable to pay the non-Federal share of the cost of programs assisted under this Act.).
5. Considers special needs of LEAs, e.g.,
    - a. high incidence of unemployment
    - b. sparse population
    - c. relatively few students.
6. Specifies information LEAs will be expected to provide.
7. Describes procedures for LEA appeal.

---

*This element does not appear in P.L. 93-380. Response to this element should constitute a discrete section of the State Plan.

# SOUTHWEST REGIONAL LABORATORY
# GUIDELINES FOR ADDING TO STATE PLANS FOR CAREER EDUCATION TO COMPLY WITH
# P.L. 95-207: THE CAREER EDUCATION INCENTIVE ACT

These Guidelines are designed to assist States as they bring their existing State Plans for Career Education into compliance with P.L. 95-207, the Career Education Incentive Act. Examples given are just that: examples. States are encouraged to let their own priorities and concerns guide the content of their Plans.

There are some requirements in P.L. 95-207 that were not included in P.L. 93-380 requirements. All States will need to review their Plans carefully and make sure they specifically satisfy all the requirements of both laws.

These Guidelines address only the requirements of P.L. 95-207. They assume that all requirements of P.L. 93-380 have been satisfied in your Plan. We have used the same order for presenting the elements for each law; this should help you see relationships and know where to address a particular issue.

You are encouraged to organize your Plans according to the elements as they are presented here, in order to facilitate review of your Plan by OCE staff to determine your eligibility for FY 1980 funding under the Career Education Incentive Act.

A. Presents SEA's definition of career education and the conceptual base upon which career education in the State rests.

   There are some concepts included here that were not part of P.L. 93-380.

   1. The section which presents the States' definition and conceptual base should specifically include concepts a through d as shown in the list of Elements and Criteria for P.L. 95-207, while

supporting the importance of work in our society, particularly stresses the importance of relating work values to other life roles. Some of these life roles, such as family member, spouse, parent, leisurite, community member, annuitant, should be named as you address this concept.

The elimination of bias and stereotyping is also stressed. Display this as an integral part of your conceptual base.

B. Describes the need for career education within the State.

(No additions required.)

C. Describes the State's career education efforts and accomplishments to date to meet identified needs, including an assessment of existing programs, practices, and materials.

(No additions required.)

D. Specifies the objectives the State will seek to achieve in implementing career education within the State by the end of each fiscal year of funding, FY 79 through FY 83.

Review your Plan's objectives carefully, and make sure they address each of the requirements 1 through 5 shown in the list of elements and criteria.

Objectives should indicate what the State will achieve as a result of implementation of the State Plan. You should have both process objectives (what the State will do, e.g., conduct regional training sessions for LEA coordinators of career education) and outcome objectives (what will be accomplished by the doing, e.g., LEA coordinators attending regional workshops will develop tentative plans for their LEAs, which provide for career education for all students in elementary and secondary schools).

The objectives for each of the 5 years should reflect incremental progression toward having career education widely implemented by the end of the 5th year.

1. This requirement is found also in P.L. 93-380, but is repeated here to reinforce the need to state objectives that represent provision of career education for students at each level. Analysis of State Plans submitted for review reveals that many States presented global objectives about career education for all students, but did not present the State's objectives for career education at each level.
2. It is not enough to state that bias and stereotyping will be avoided. The law states that the Plan must provide for overcoming bias and stereotyping. Therefore, you will need to have one or more objectives which indicate what the State will do to eliminate bias and stereotyping, and the expected effects of this action.

include race, sex, age, economic status and handicap as integral parts of these objectives. Objectives should reflect elimination of bias and stereotyping at both the State and local levels.

3. State Plan objectives need to have focus. In other words, it isn't enough to say that the State will train Intermediate Educational Agency (IEA) personnel to work with LEAs. The content of such training must be stated, with outcome objectives that reflect transfer of State goals to LEA operations. In the case of this criterion, there are several concepts which need to be addressed. The objectives should ensure LEA focus on career awareness, exploration, planning and decision-making.
4. At least one objective should be geared toward students developing knowledge, skills and attitudes that both prepare them and predispose them to accept work as part of life. You will probably need separate objectives to cover the concept of relating work values to other life roles (student, parent, community member, annuitant, etc.).
5. Although you may have objectives satisfying this criterion, many State Plans included the concept in their definition/conceptual base, but did not include it in their objectives. The objectives should address the concept.

E. Sets forth the strategies (methods), activities and resources to be utilized in implementing the one- and five-year plans.

1. One of the most common problems in State Plans is the failure to present strategies that are related to each objective, and that show promise of achieving the objective. Now that you have added objectives to your P.L. 93-380 Plan, check your strategies carefully and make sure that you have indicated how the State will achieve each objective.

   A useful checklist would be the following:

   | Objectives | Strategies (methods) | Resources | Evaluation |
   |---|---|---|---|
   | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
   |  | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
   | 2.0 | etc. | etc. | etc. |

   With such a checklist the relationships between the elements are obvious, and it is easy to see that each has been addressed.

2. Indicate what the State will do to make sure that handicapped students, members of both sexes, etc., have access to career education programs in their LEAs. Whether or not LEAs are receiving State or Federal career education funds, the State can and must require that all LEAs provide for equal access of all students. Most, if not all, States already require such assurances before releasing funds under basic aid to public schools. Procedures and conditions of such assurances should be provided here.

3. Suggested methods for overcoming bias and stereotyping include the following:
    a. purchase only materials free of bias and stereotyping
    b. alert students and take measurement to counteract bias and stereotyping in existing materials
    c. give students opportunities to see nontraditional role models
    d. develop materials free of bias and stereotyping

    States might have curriculum guides reviewed to remove bias and stereotyping. There are many stragegies a State might use, but remember that the strategies should be geared toward overcoming bias and stereotyping.

4. This criterion can be satisfied while attending to criteria 1 through 8 of this element. Again, you are reminded that you will need to display the processes the *State* will employ to ensure that LEA programs reflect the comprehensive instructional strategies reflected in *a* through *f*. These methods should be related to your outcome objectives. Methods could include, for instance, 1) "Hold a series of skill-building workshops for LEA coordinators of career education throughout the State, designed to help them develop local plans"; 2) "Train IEA personnel to assist LEAs in the development of their plans"; 3) "Require that completed LEA plans reflect criteria *a* through *f* in order to qualify for allocation of P.L. 95-207 funds for program implementation." The outcome objective could be "Funded LEA career education programs will reflect a comprehensive instructional strategy which includes . . . (*a* through *f*).

5. Both P.L. 93-380 and P.L. 95-207 indicate that congress is convinced that involvement of a broad range of populations is basic to effective career education. Unfortunately, many educators are still locked into the concept that speakers from the community, field trips into the community, and the availability of work experience constitute school-community collaboration. Too often, there is no collaboration, and these contacts are not planned to make specific contributions to the career education development of students. Whereas each of the activities mentioned may have value, they need to be enhanced, in order to constitute "methods." Moreover, other methods will need to be employed in order to effectively employ the skills of the other populations mentioned. The State needs to suggest a model or models for such collaboration, and to communicate these models to LEAs in such a way that LEAs will adopt/adapt them.

Again, you are reminded that your methods (process objectives) should lead to measurable/observable outcomes (outcome objectives) and both should be stated. An effective way to address this requirement would be for the State to model collaboration by including persons from each of these populations in both planning and technical assistance activities. Guidelines for LEAs can be communicated in many ways, and the outcomes of this communication can range from increased LEA staff awareness of techniques for involving these populations in program implementation, to inclusion of these techniques in written LEA plans.

6. The definition and discussion of career education in the law reflect a conviction that rather than being a separate subject, career education should be infused into all curricular areas. This requires coordination with other programs.

There are two levels of program coordination, and each should be addressed. First show how the State is achieving coordination of career education with other State programs (e.g., vocational education, Title I, etc.) by such process objectives as "Include career education in the currululum guidelines for each subject area at each level," and, "Coordinate technical assistance with that provided by other State Department units such as vocational education, Title I, etc." For these two sample process objectives to be considered "methods," you would need to say how each of these would be accomplished, e.g., for the curriculum guidelines and, "by preparing criteria to be applied in revision of each set of guidelines."

The second level of program coordination to be reflected in State Plans is the LEA level. State methods would have to be designed to ensure that LEAs would be made aware of how to achieve such coordination at the local level, that they would be encouraged to do so, and that the State would monitor their achievement of such coordination.

By now you probably have noticed that there are several criteria which ask you to make sure your objectives and methods reflect certain concepts. All of these appear in the law and/or in its coordination at the LEA level, but it can and should display the objectives and methods it will employ to insure LEAs' follow-through with this concept. It is not enough to distribute State Plans to LEAs, even if these Plans do include guidelines that reflect these concepts. You should show what the State will do to make sure the guidelines are translated into action.

7. The checklist format included under 1 above serves to remind the developers of State Plans to identify the resources to be used for each objective and strategy. There are four types of resources: human, financial, material and technological. The intent is that the State explore the availability of resources beyond its own career education unit, including other State Department units, as well as resources available throughout the State and the nation. Your methods for attaining outcome objectives consistent with the requirements of the law should vary enough to require the use of a broad range of resources, and these resources should be listed.

   The State methods should also provide assistance to LEAs in identifying and using a variety of resources in a community that expands well beyond the schools. Because of the requirement that objectives and methods be stated for each of five years, timelines should be presented in such a way that it is easy to discern explicitly the objectives the State will seek to achieve by the end of each year. Objectives should reflect wide implementation of comprehensive career education programs by the end of the fifth year.

8. To clarify the relationship between various levels of objectives as well as the integration of Plan components, indicate LEA outcomes of State level objectives.

F. Specifies plans for evaluating the effectiveness of career education inputs, processes and outcomes in local education agencies and in personnel training programs.

1. The key here is the requirement that the State define the criteria for evaluation. It is not enough to say that the State will conduct an evaluation, or even to state how the evaluation will be conducted (e.g., use of a questionnaire, critical incidents, etc.). The how should be stated, of course, but the criteria for evaluating the extent to which State Plan objectives have been attained must be presented. These are the indicators the State will use to determine the effectiveness of the Plan in meeting objectives, so they can report this to the Commissioner. Criteria should be provided for evaluation of each major objective, and should define levels of achievement that will be acceptable.

   Criteria could include such indicators as the following:

   a. Continued evidence of a functional and functioning Career Education Advisory Group .

   b. Curriculum guides evidencing infusion of career education.

   c. Reports of staff development activities in career education.

   d. Results of statewide career awareness testing program.

   e. Results of opinion sampling of random population of parents, teachers, students, related to career education activities and outcomes.

   f. LEA budgets reflecting expenditures related directly to career education objectives.

g. number or percent of LEAs submitting reports of implementation activities.

(To satisfy this section of P.L. 95-207, both the 'Was it done? and the "How well as it done?" questions need to be addressed.)

2. Besides State criteria for evaluation, there should be guidelines to help LEAs develop criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of of their plans.

G. Specifies plans for disseminating information about career education, career education practices and products, and the results of career education efforts to interested persons within the State.

(No additions.)

H. (P.L. 93-380: Specifies the funding that will be needed to implement the various components of the one-year and five-year plans and the sources of the necessary funding, where those sources are available.)

P.L. 95-207: Describes the methods by which the funds received under the Act will be used (consistent with Section 8 of P.L. 95-207) to implement the overall objectives in each fiscal year of funding.

The law is very specific in stating the information that must be included in the Plan in the section on use of P.L. 95-207 funds. To assist you in this task, all legal requirements pertaining to this component have been excerpted, as presented in the document on Elements and criteria. Most of the criteria are self-explanatory. The following summary comments should provide some further direction: (These numbers do not coincide with the numbers on the list of Elements and criteria. These are summary comments only.)

1. The State Plan must include an SEA Plan for the use and expenditure of funds (not just a budget).
2. The planned expenditure of funds for each of the five years of Federal funding must be presented in relation to the State Plan objectives, with consistent timelines.
3. Amounts and sources of funds that may be used for career education other than P.L. 95-207 funds, must be specified.
4. Federal portions of funds in various categories may not exceed those prescribed by the law.
5. Plans must reflect inclusion of nonpublic schools.
6. Plans must reflect compliance with specific criteria for a) employing additional State personnel for administration and coordination of programs under CEIA (16.1); b) providing State leadership for career education (16.2); c) making payments to LEAs (16.3) only for comprehensive programs as specified by the criteria; and d) reviewing and revising State Plans.

7. The State Plan must contain specific details of how P.L. 95-207 funds will be allocated to LEAs, including application procedures.

Obviously, this section must contain both a written plan for the use of funds, and a budget that reflects the plan and is related to the objectives to be attained each fiscal year.

I. Shows relationship of the State Plan for Career Education to career education activities being carried out and contemplated in post-secondary and adult education settings.

(No additions.)

J. Specifies the manner in which the plan is to be implemented and administered by the SEA, including provision of adequate assurance that the requirements of Section 6 of P.L. 95-207, related to applications, nonfederal share costs, and review of plans, will be met in each fiscal year of funding after 1979.

P.L. 95-207 funds will flow from the federal government to the States. It is the State Plans that must provide assurances that Section 6 requirements have been met. Section 6 requirements appear as 1.0 through 9.0 in the attached list of elements and criteria. It would be desirable for the State to include these requirements in its procedures for allocating funds to LEAs (Element K).

1. Objectives, methods and resources specified for element D and E should satisfy this criterion.
2. Self explanatory.
3. Whether 95-207 funds will be used to employ a coordinator of career education, or a current State Department staff member will be assigned this responsibility, there must be evidence that experience in career education is a primary criterion for selection or assignment. In the case of assigning the responsibility to a current staff member, s/he should be named and his/her qualifications should be listed. In the case of employing a new staff member, desired qualifications should be listed, including experience in career education.
4. (This applies only to states receiving more than $125,000.) This criterion requires that staff for administration of the program be named, and their qualifications listed (at lease evidence of one having had experience with respect to discrimination and stereotyping, and one professionally trained in guidance

and counseling). If staff members are yet to be employed, qualifications to be used as criteria in their selection should be stated.

5. Plans for review and submission of amendments to the State Plans could be included in the objectives/methods/resources section. (E.g., objective: Current State Plans will reflect modifications as suggested by annual review; methods: 1) prepare an annual report of the extent to which the process and outcome objectives of the State Plan have been attained, with a discussion of problems and attempted solutions. 2) Submit report to advisory panel for review and recommendation. 3) Prepare amendments to Plan as needed, and submit to OCE for approval.

   An alternate approach to addressing this criterion would be to include in the management plan procedures for annual review and revision of the State Plan. These procedures should be definitive so there is no question of how the task will be accomplished.

6. Merely stating that career education is for all students will not satisfy this Element. The specific criteria, 1.0 through 7.0, must be satisfied. Handicapped, members of both sexes, and other subpopulations of your State must be named.
   a. Policy statements are the best devices for assuring that concepts are consistently reflected throughout a Plan (SEA or LEA). The policy statement should be in the first section of your Plan, along with your definition and conceptual base defined by P.L. 93-380. The policy should

state that each level (SEA, IEA, and LEA) of education agencies will provide equal access of all students, (specify special populations) to career education programs carried out under the State Plan.

b. Methods for achieving equal access should be stated. What will the State do to make sure that LEAs provide for equal access? One way to satisfy this criterion would be to include in your procedures for allocating funds to LEAs (C/E BI, 1.0) a requirement that their plan include policies and procedures for assuring equal access. Also the State's communication/dissemination/training/technical assistance activities should include preparation of guidelines for LEAs to follow, and methods for helping LEAs translate these guidelines into action.

c. The State needs to provide Guidelines to support LEA efforts to achieve equal access. These Guidelines should be included in the State Plan.

d. If you have specifically mentioned handicapped in your policies and procedures, and in the LEA Guidelines, this criterion will have been met.

e. & f. The State Plan should reflect the use of nonpublic school representatives both in the preparation of the State Plan and on the State's ongoing advisory group, if any. State objectives and methods should be designed to insure LEAs' inclusion of nonpublic school students and teachers both in the development of their local plans and in the activities of the program.

A suggested device for insuring such inclusion is to require that LEA Plans must specify objectives and procedures for including nonpublic school teachers and students in order to quality for allocation of funds.

Whether or not LEAs are receiving State or Federal career education funds, the State can and must require that all LEAs provide for equal access of all students. Most, if not all, States already require such assurances before releasing funds under basic aid to public schools. Procedures and conditions of such assurances should be provided here.

g. This should be part of the LEA application procedure for CEIA funds.

7. If the objectives and strategies sections (elements D and E) include these concepts, this criterion has been satisfied.

8. The State Plan is to be a five-year Plan, with each Element (objectives, funding, equal access, etc.) being presented for each year. It would be helpful to organize State Plans and Reports by Elements as presented in the list of Elements and criteria, with each of the five years of funding presented consecutively under each Element. For FY 1980 on, plans for reporting to the Commissioner must include provision for subcriteria a through d for this Element, as presented in the list of Elements and criteria.

   a. For each outcome objective the State is to achieve in the year being reported, evidence of the degree to which it was achieved must be presented in the report. For instance, if one objective for FY 1980 was to have State-approved plans in 1/4 of the LEAs in the State, the report would include number of LEA plans submitted to the State for approval, criteria used in reviewing them, and results of the review, including number of LEA plans meeting the criteria.

Extent to which process objectives had been attained should also be reported. For instance, if the State presented nine regional workshops to train 450 LEA staff members, to develop LEA plans, the report would present documentation of the workshops including dates, times, places, participants and agenda.

b. The guidelines for Element A stressed the need for identifying and using a variety of resources. The managing, monitoring and evaluation components of the State Plan should provide for accurate and timely recording of the use of resources at the State level, and such use should be detailed in the annual report. In order to include in the report the description of the extent to which LEAs are using State and local resources to achieve objectives, you will need to include in the Section covered by Element B1, the requirement that LEAs report such use to the State as a condition for allocation of funds.

c. Since Element B and B1 require specific budget and funding details, the management plan should include procedures for monitoring and reporting the extent to which the funds have been used to achieve the objectives (Element B, criterion

13 requires that fiscal year objectives be linked to fiscal year funds).

d. The State Plan must include provision for describing both SEA and LEA programs funded, together with an analysis of the reasons for success or failure. Procedures for allocating CEIA funds to LEAs (Element B1) should include a requirement that LEAs furnish descriptive and evaluative data about their programs to the State as a condition for allocation of funds.

9. The law is specific about CEIA funds and CEIA purchased property being administered by a public agency. Your Plan needs to reflect provision for inclusion of non public school teachers and students in career education programs. It must also show how these funds and properties will be administered.

10. This criterion needs no explanation. Just be sure your management plan contains this provision.

K. Describes the methods by which the State will make payments to the LEAs of funds received under the Career Education Incentive Act (consistent with Section 8(a), Paragraph 3, P.L. 95-207. This Element does not appear in P.L. 93-380. It is a very important part of the P.L. 95-207 Plan.

1. Element H specifies the activities, resources, and personnel for which CEIA funds can be used, by SEAs and by LEAs. Element K requires the State to specify how the State funds will be allocated to LEAs. In other words, what criteria will be used to determine which LEAs get how much of the CEIA money.

2. State the procedures the LEAs will have to follow in order to apply for funds.

3. Tell how the applications will be reviewed. Who will review them? How will the application criteria and the criteria for allocation of funds be applied?

4. This specifies how States may not allocate CEIA money to LEAs. Be sure your criteria for allocation are in compliance.

5. Refer to any special populations in your State, and indicate how their special needs will be met.

6. This is your opportunity to ensure that LEAs will provide comprehensive programs which reflect the State's definition and conceptual model. Don't treat this section lightly. At this point you can require submission of LEA plans, inclusion of objectives that extend the State's efforts, periodic reports for monitoring LEAs' progress with the implementation of their plans. This section should be prepared with considerable thought about how it can provide for extension of State Plan concepts into LEA implementation.

# APPENDIX C

## National Advisory Panel

## Project 0249

## Advisory Panel Members

Ms. Barbara Preli
Jefferson County Public Schools
J. Graham Brown Education Center
675 River City Mall
Louisville, KY 40202

502 581-5630 O
502 228-3585

Dr. Anne Upton, Program Administrator
Pupil Personnel Services
California State Department
of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814

916 322-6352 O
916 961-8380 H

Dr. Norman C. Gysbers
Professor of Education
College of Education
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65201

314 882-6386 O
314 442-3433 H

Dr. David V. Tiedeman
Professor of Education and
Director of Vocational,
Technical, and Career
Education
313 Swen Parsons Library
Northern Illinois University
De Kalb, IL 60115

815 753-1306 O
815 758-5965 H